

A
~~409.6.10
1745~~
TRUE NARRATIVE

Of the CASE between

The Episcopal Congregation in the Seagate of
Dundee, on the one part;

A N D

Bishop Raitt, with the Reverend Mr. William
Robertson, on the other.

W I T H

An APPENDIX:
CONTAINING,

Some REMARKS upon Part of an anonymous Pamphlet, intitled, *An instructed historical Account of the Settlement in the Episcopal Congregation of Dundee in 1727, &c.*

Written and published by the Gentlemen of the Seagate Congregation.

To which is added,

A LETTER from Mr. Smith to Mr. Fife.

Buy the truth, and sell it not. Prov. xxiii. 23.

But evil men and seducers shall wax worse and worse, deceiving, and being deceived. But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them; and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. 2 Tim. iii. 13. 14. 15.

Amica pax, magis amica veritas.

E D I N B U R G H:

Printed by W. SANDS, A. MURRAY, and J. COCHRAN. 1745.

[Price One Shilling.]

ЕВІТА ЯЯЛІ ЕҰЛДА

nowed up to 10

The Biological Conclusion in the Series of Diseases on the One Hand

G. J. L.

Biggs Run with the Roaring Mill Mill

三國志

AN APPENDIX:

СИНИАТРО



卷之三

561.1M сюжетов под языком А

THE
P R E F A C E.

THE wise Man says, That a good name is rather to be chosen than great riches; That it is better than precious ointment.

This just Observation is so riveted in the Minds of the thinking Part of Mankind, that they reckon nothing too hard or hazardous to undertake in defence of Reputation.

Reputation is certainly the dearest Thing in Life; and nothing but a sincere and earnest Desire of vindicating that, could have induced us to appear in Print. And if, in vindicating our own, we are obliged to narrate Facts which bear hard upon the Characters of others, we cannot help it; for we need not be afraid to tell Truth; and Self-defence is, by all, owned to be the first Principle in Nature.

Our Reputation has been traduced, in a very remarkable Manner, as far as the Tongues and Pens of our Adversaries can go; and therefore we have been called upon, by all the Disinterested, to appear publickly in our own Vindication. Wherefore we reckoned ourselves obliged to publish the following NARRATIVE, in order to wipe off the Reproaches which have been thrown upon us.

As

As to the Facts therein narrated, they are, to our Knowledge, fairly represented: And as for the Performance in other respects, we must leave it to take its Fate. We pretend to neither great Learning or Eloquence: But this we can honestly say, that, through all our Procedure in this unlucky Affair, we have been actuated by real Principle.

P. S. Some Weeks after we had finished our Narrative, there appeared an anonymous Pamphlet, intitled, An instructed historical Account of the Settlement in the Episcopal Congregation of Dundee in 1727, &c. As in this Pamphlet some Facts relative to our late Misfortunes, and altogether unknown to almost all of us, are advanced, and others grossly misrepresented, it was judged necessary to make some Remarks on them; which we have done in an Appendix.

We have also (with leave of the Author) inserted, at the End, a Letter from Mr. Smith to our Reverend Pastor.

A TRUE NARRATIVE O F

The Case between the Episcopal Congregation in the Seagate of *Dundee*, on the one Part; and Bishop *Raitt*, with the Rev. Mr. *William Robertson*, on the other.

AS a just Regard and Esteem for Religion and Virtue, and a cheerful regular Practice in religious Duties, is what will make us easy in this World, and happy in the next, it is no Wonder that Mankind should be solicitous about a Business of so great Importance.

It is a Precept of our blessed Saviour, and of his Apostles, That we should profess ourselves the Disciples of Jesus Christ before Men, if we would have him own us for his when he shall pass Sentence on the Quick and Dead at the last Day. This we, (though unworthy), with all Humility, Thankfulness, and Sincerity, profess; and we heartily pray Almighty God to make us worthy.

§ I. We believe, that the holy Scriptures are a perfect Revelation of all divine Truths necessary to Salvation; consequently, the sole Rule of our Faith and Manners.

“ As the Will of God [says Bp *Beveridge*] is the Rule and Measure of all that is good; so there is nothing that deserves that Name, but what is agreeable and conformable thereto: And this Will being fully revealed and contained in the holy Scripture, it will be necessary for me, in directing my Course over the Ocean of this World, that I should fix my Eye continually upon this Star, steer by this Compass, and make it the only Land-mark by which I am to be guided to my wished-for Haven. I am sure the Word of God is the good old Way that will bring me to my Father’s House; for how should that Way but lead me to Heaven, which Truth itself has chalked out for me? ”

We are persuaded, that the stated Maxim and established catholic Rule of the Fathers, as well as of the Reformed, was this, *That nothing is absolutely necessary either to be believed or practised, but what is taught or commanded in the holy Scriptures.* Indeed the co-

pious Collections of many learned Men of the Reformed do irrefragably demonstrate this against the Romish Writers. The Church's Opinion with regard to this, is manifest from the 6th and 20th Articles of our Religion. The Church's Care to maintain and support this, is no less evident from her Form of ordaining Priests and Consecration of Bishops; wherein every Priest when he is ordained, as well as every Bishop when he is consecrated, doth solemnly engage to teach or maintain nothing as required of necessity to eternal Salvation, but that which they are persuaded may be concluded and proved by the holy Scriptures.

" That we are [says the worthy Prelate above named, in his Exposition of the 6th Article] to stick to the Word of God, and not look among the Traditions of Men for the Articles of our Faith, or the Behaviour of our Life, Christ himself teacheth us in these Words: *But in vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men*, Matth. xv. 9. So that whatever Worship we perform to God, unless it be of God's commanding, it never will be of God's accepting: It will be but a vain Worship. Nay, it will be so far from God's Acceptance, that he will utterly reject it: For it is so far from being a Duty, that it is in plain Terms a Sin; for so saith our Saviour, *Why do you also transgress the command of God by your traditions?* vers. 3. And, *Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none effect by your traditions*, vers. 6. So that to obtrude Traditions of Men for Articles of Faith, or to admit them for Parts of Divine Worship necessary to Salvation, is so far from having any Countenance from Scriptures, that it is expressly forbidden in them. And therefore, that it should be necessary to believe any Thing merely upon Tradition, is itself a mere Tradition."

The learned Mr. Chillingworth, in his Book, intitled, *The Religion of Protestants a Safe Way to Salvation*, says, " By the Religion of Protestants, I understand that wherein they all agree, and subscribe with great Harmony, as a perfect Rule of their Faith and Actions; that is, the BIBLE. I say, the BIBLE only is the Religion of Protestants! Whatsoever else they believe besides it, and the plain, irrefragable, indubitable Consequences of it, well may they hold it as a Matter of Opinion; but as a Matter of Faith and Religion, neither can they with Coherence to their own Grounds believe it themselves, nor require the Belief of it of others, without most high and most schismatical Presumption. I, for my part, after a long and (as I verily believe and hope) impartial Search of the true Way to eternal Happiness, do profess plainly, that I cannot find any Rest for the Sole of my Foot, but upon this Rock only. I see plainly, and with mine own Eyes, that there are Popes against Popes, Councils against Councils,

cils, some Fathers against others, the same Fathers against them-selves, a Consent of Fathers of one Age against a Consent of Fathers of another Age, the Church of one Age against the Church of another Age. Tradition Interpretations of Scripture are pretended, but there are few or none to be found. No Tradition, but only of Scripture, can derive itself from the Fountain; but may be plainly proved, either to have been brought in, in such an Age after Christ, or that in such an Age it was not in. In a Word, there is no sufficient Certainty, but of Scripture only, for any considering Man to build upon. This therefore, and this only, I have Reason to believe: This I will profess; according to this I will live; and for this, if there be occasion, I will not only willingly, but even gladly lose my Life, though I should be sorry that Christians should take it from me.—I am fully persuaded, that God does not, and that therefore Man ought not, to require any more of any Man than this, to believe the Scripture to be God's Word, to endeavour to find the true Sense of it, and to live according to it.—All necessary Truth being, as I have proved, plainly set down in Scripture, I am certain, by believing Scripture, to believe all necessary Truth: And he that does so, if his Life be answerable to his Faith, how is it possible he should fail of Salvation?"

Bp Beveridge (on the 20th Article) says, "That the Scriptures are always to be acknowledged to be the Rule both of our Faith and Manners, and the supreme Judge according to whose Sentence all Opinions must either stand or fall." And the worthy Bp Patrick, in discoursing upon the Vanity of appealing to Tradition, says, "But it is sufficient for the Direction of every honest hearted Man to know, (which is as certain as any thing of that Nature can be, and may be undoubtedly relied on); that nothing is clearer in the Tradition of the Church than this, That the Doctors of it declare the Scriptures to be full and perspicuous in all needful Matters. And therefore there needs no other Tradition, but the Tradition of the Scriptures; which satisfy us abundantly in the Truth of all those Things which are universally received."

From all which, we reckon it quite inconsistent with sound Divinity, to make two Rules of essential and necessary Practice, if not also of Faith, viz. the holy Scriptures, and Tradition; nay, and in some respects, to prefer Tradition to the Scriptures! We think this is visibly to open a Door to innumerable Corruptions in Worship.

We think, that, to vent Doctrines, not founded on Scripture, but upon Tradition and Custom only, and to obtrude these as necessary and essential Grounds of divine Worship, is plainly to deny the holy Scriptures to be the sole Rule of our Faith and Manners;

ners ; and evidently to put Tradition (a very uncertain, deceitful, and dangerous Guide) upon a Level with the inspired Word of God, which is Truth itself, and can never deceive us.

We own, that a great Reverence is due to the Church and its Testimony, yet only as to an human Testimony ; which cannot equal that of the holy Scriptures : For we firmly believe these sacred Records to be the only Rule as to what is essential either in Doctrine or Practice. And we agree with a learned Divine of the Church of *England*, when he says, " Whatever is necessary for a Christian to believe or practise, in order to everlasting Salvation, is, in holy Scripture, declared in such a Way and Manner, as the Wisdom of God, who best knows the Circumstances and Condition of Mankind, has thought fit. This God himself has made the Standard for all Ranks and Orders, for all Capacities and Abilities ; and to set up any other above, or upon the Level with it, is dishonouring God, and abusing of Men. All the Authority in the World cannot make any thing an Article of Faith, but what God has made so ; neither can any Power establish or impose upon Men, more or less, or otherwise than what the Scripture commands. God has given every Man proportionable Faculties and Abilities of Mind, some stronger, and some weaker ; and he has, by his own Authority, made the Scripture the Rule of Religion to them all : It is therefore their indispensable Duty, to examine diligently, and study attentively this Rule, to instruct themselves in the Knowledge of religious Truths from hence, and to form the best Judgment they can of the Nature of them."

Agreeable to this is what Bp *Beveridge* (on the 20th Article) says, from *St Basil*, *That such Hearers as are instructed in the Scriptures, ought to examine those Things that are spoken by their Teachers, and to receive such Things as are consonant to the Scriptures ; but to reject such Things as are contrary to them, and by all means to turn away from those that persist in such Doctrines.*

Our blessed Saviour himself says, *If ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed*, John viii. 31. which is giving us a positive Assurance, that no Man can be Christ's Disciple indeed, if he doth not continue in his Word.

It is most certain, that nothing ought to be imposed upon Christians, but what is agreeable to this holy Word. If any thing further be imposed upon them as essential and necessary, it is without any Authority. For surely no fair Judge can require a Christian to believe a Doctrine came from Christ, which he does not find in the only faithful and undoubted Records, in which all are agreed the Revelation of Christ is derived down to us.

Bp *Patrick* says, *It is our Wisdom therefore to adhere to the Scripture.*
To

To this Rule let us stick. Let this be his Guide who would not go astray in dangerous Paths; into which he cannot fall, who keeps close to the Directions of the holy Books.

The deviating from the pure Simplicity of the Religion of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, has been, and still is, we humbly think, the Cause of all the fierce Controversies and unhappy Divisions which rend and confound the Church of Christ. For, had Christians been contented with making the Doctrine delivered by Jesus Christ the sole Rule of Faith, without any Fictions or Inventions of Men; the Church of Christ would certainly have been one universal, regular, uniform Thing, and not such a Mixture and Confusion as we now behold it. But when Christians once began to establish Doctrines of their own, and to impose them upon others by human Authority as Rules of Faith, (which is the Foundation of Antichrist), then there began to be as many Schemes of Religion, as there were Parties of Men who had different Judgment, and got the Power into their Hands. A very little Acquaintance with Ecclesiastical History does but too sadly confirm the Truth of this. For, when human Things are put upon a Level with divine, and doubtful Things, to say no worse of them, made equal with those that are certain, there can be no End of Contention, no Hopes of Peace, which all pious Men ought earnestly to desire, and endeavour to promote. Whereas, would Christians submit all their different Opinions to be examined and decided by the Truth of God's holy Word, which is Truth itself, and cannot deceive us; and if we all took our Doctrines from this one ancient and sure Rule; as we should have Truth in our Principles, so we should have Unity in our Affections; it would banish Heresy and Schism also, and all Christians might live in Unity and godly Love, so that the Church would be an Emblem of Heaven.

§ II. As we are firmly persuaded, that the Church of England, in its Faith, Government, and Discipline, is the most conformable to the Rules of holy Scripture, and consequently the most pure and primitive, of any Church in the World; therefore we most willingly and openly profess ourselves to be of the Communion of that Church. All of us have been bred and educated, and most of us christened, and confirmed accordingly. And this we reckon our great Happiness.

The learned Dr. Comber's *Companion to the Temple* is an excellent Paraphrase and Illustration of the Liturgy of the Church of England; and we beg leave to recommend it to the serious Perusal of all our Fellow-Christians; which, if they read with Attention, we are persuaded, will daily increase their Love and Esteem for that excellent Form of Worship. The just Character and Encomium

ceitful,
of God,
and its
sacred
in Do-
of the
y for a
vation,
as the
d Con-
self has
acilities
the Le-
All the
icle of
wer e-
e than
n pro-
r, and
e Scri-
eir in-
ely this
Truths
Nature
Article)
e Scri-
Teach-
s; but
to turn
, then
positive
th not
Chri-
ng fur-
without
ristian
ind in
agreed
ipture.
To

comium of which, we shall here give in the Doctor's own Words, being Part of his Preface.

" But here [says the Doctor] I must not expatiate into the particular Encomium which every Part of the Liturgy deserves. That would make the Porch larger than the House, and may better be seen in the following Discourse. Only at present we may say this of it in general, That, though all Churches in the World have, and ever had Forms of Prayer, yet none was ever blessed with so comprehensive, so exact, and so inoffensive a Composure; which is so judiciously contrived, that the *wisest* may at once exercise their Knowledge and Devotion; and yet so plain, that the *most ignorant* may pray with Understanding: so full, that nothing is omitted that is fit to be asked in publick; so particular, that it comprises most Things which we would pray for in private; and yet so short, as not to tire any that have true Devotion. Its *Doctrine* is pure and primitive; its *Ceremonies* so few and innocent, that most of the Christian World agree in them. Its *Method* is exact and natural: Its *Language* is significant and perspicuous, most of the Words and Phrases being taken out of holy Scripture, and the rest are the Expressions of the first and best Ages; so that, whoever takes Exceptions at these, must quarrel with the Language of the Holy Ghost, and fall out with the Church in her greatest Innocence. Indeed, the greatest Part of these Prayers are primitive, or a second Edition of the most ancient Liturgies of the Eastern and Western Churches corrected and amended. And, in the Opinion of the most impartial and excellent *Grotius*, (who was no Member of, nor had any Obligation to this Church), the *English Liturgy* comes so near that Pattern, that none of the Reformed Churches can compare with it. And, if any Thing external be needful to recommend that which is so glorious within, we may add, That the *Composers* were all Men of great Piety and Learning; for they were all either *Martyrs* or *Confessors* upon the Restitution of Popery; which, as it declares their Piety, so the judicious digesting of these Prayers doth evidence their Learning: For therein a Scholar can discern close Logick, pleasing Rhetorick, pure Divinity, and the very Marrow of all the ancient Doctrine and Discipline; and yet all made so familiar, that the Unlearned may safely say *Amen*. Lastly, All these Excellencies have obtained that universal Reputation, which these Prayers enjoy in all the World: So that they are deservedly admired by the Eastern Churches, and had in great Esteem by the most eminent Protestants beyond the Seas, (the most impartial Judges). In fine, This *Liturgy* is honoured by all but the *Romanist*, whose Interest it opposeth; and some *Dissenters*,

“ ers, whose Prejudice will not let them see its Lustre: Whence it
 “ is they call that (which Papists hate, because it is Protestant)
 “ superstitious and Popish; and, though they count it *Roman*, con-
 “ demn it without a Hearing. But, when we remember, the best
 “ Things in a bad World have most Enemies, as it doth not lessen
 “ its Worth, so it must not abate our Esteem, because it hath mali-
 “ cious and misguided Adversaries.

“ How endless it is to dispute with these, the little Success of the
 “ best Arguments, managed by the wisest of Men, do too sadly
 “ testify: Wherefore I shall decline that, and endeavour to con-
 “ vincere the Enemies, by assisting the Friends of our Church-devo-
 “ tions; and, by drawing that Vail which the Ignorance and In-
 “ devotion of some, and the Passion and Prejudice of others have
 “ cast over them, I shall represent the *Liturgy* in its true and native
 “ Lustre; which is so lovely and ravishing, that, like the purest
 “ Beauties, it needs no Supplement of Art and Dressing, but con-
 “ quers by its own Attractives, and wins the Affections of all but
 “ those that do not see it clearly. This will be sufficient, I am
 “ sure, to shew, that whoever desires no more than to worship God
 “ with Zeal and Knowledge, Spirit and Truth, Purity and Sinceri-
 “ ty, may do it by these devout Forms.

“ Let me intreat them to ponder the divine All-sufficiency, and
 “ their own great Necessities, before they begin; and to keep their
 “ Heart close to every Petition as they go along; and they will find
 “ them all so fit to be asked, and so likely to be obtained; so a-
 “ greeable to their own Wants, and to the Necessities of all Man-
 “ kind; that it will be pleasant to ask them, and delightful to ex-
 “ pect a gracious Answer to them. And, if they daily come, and
 “ constantly use the *Common Prayer* in this Manner, they will nei-
 “ ther be tired with the Length, nor wearied with the frequent Re-
 “ petition thereof: For it will appear to be the most noble and com-
 “ fortable Exercise that Religion doth afford; it will increase their
 “ Graces, multiply their Blessings, and fit them for the never-ceasing
 “ Service of the *heavenly Choir*. *May the God of Peace therefore*
 “ *reconcile us to these Prayers, and to one another, giving us pious and*
 “ *zealous Priests, devout and well-disposed People, that we may have*
 “ *full Churches, frequent Prayers, and fervent Charity; than*
 “ *which nothing will more conduce to the publick Happiness of this Na-*
 “ *tion, and the Salvation of all our Souls. The good Lord grant it*
 “ *therefore, for Jesus's Sake. Amen.*”

Thus far Dr. Comber; with him we agree, and heartily join in the
 above Prayer.

The great Bp *Bull* says,— “ The Church of *England* will be
 “ found the best and purest Church this Day in the Christian World;
 “ upon which account I bless God I was born, baptized, and bred

“ up

" up in her Communion ; wherein I firmly resolve, by his Grace,
" to persist as long as I live."

Bp Beveridge says, " And verily, if we consider the Institution it-
" self, of that religious Worship which we thus perform, it is cer-
" tainly the best that ever was practised by any Church, as being
" most consonant to the general Rules of Devotion laid down in
" Scripture ; as also most conformable to the Discipline and Practice
" of the primitive Church."

Dr. Scot, in his Preface to that most excellent Book, *The Christian Life*, says, " In following the primitive Doctrine, I have fol-
" lowed the Doctrine of the Church of *England* ; which, in its
" Faith, Government and Discipline, I believe, in my Conscience,
" is the most primitive Church in the World."

The celebrated Author of the *Spectator* says of the Book of *Com-
mon Prayer*, " That, at least, it is as perfect as any Thing of human
" Institution." Again, and which he cites from a worthy Prelate,
" If Men were not wanting to themselves, and could but be persuaded
" to a sincere and steady Practice of the Christian Religion, as taught
" and administered in the Church of *England* ; they might still live as
" the primitive Christians did, and come short of none of those eminent
" Saints for Virtue and Holiness."

As the Liturgy of the Church of *England* is the only Liturgy that
was ever publickly received and practised in this Kingdom since the
Reformation, we therefore beg leave to say, that it is our establish-
ed Form or Standard of Worship. We know there was a Form
composed by Mr. Knox, being, as we believe, a Transcript of the
Geneva Form ; and that it was publickly practised : But, we hum-
bly think, it scarce deserves the Name of a regular Liturgy. We
know also, that there was a *Scots* Liturgy, published *anno 1636* ;
but it was never publickly received and practised, tho' endeavoured.

We are heartily sorry to acquaint the World, that, on account
of our adhering to this excellent Standard of publick Worship, (*viz.*
the Liturgy of the Church of *England*), we have, of late, been
very hardly used ; as will appear by what follows.

§ III. Upon the Death of our worthy Bishop and Pastor, Mr. John Ouchterlonie, we gave a Call to the Rev. Mr. William Robertson Minister at *Longside* in the North. We were entirely unac-
quainted with him either as to Person or Character; but agreed to
take him upon the Recommendation of Mr. James Irvine, our then
surviving Pastor, of whose orthodox Principles we were quite satis-
fied ; and he was recommended to Mr. Irvine by a Clergyman in
whom he placed the greatest Confidence ; and we ourselves had a
great Esteem for that Gentleman. But we think they have both
been deceived, and we have been deceived and abused.

Mr.

Mr. Robertson was, with the Concurrence of Bp Raitt, settled as one of our Ministers, 22d December 1742. But his Colleague Mr. Irvine was so far gone in a Consumption, that he could not officiate; but got one, in Deacons Orders, to supply his Place. Mr. Irvine died 27th February 1743.

Mr. Robertson practised the Liturgy, as directed by the Rubricks, for some Sundays after his Settlement; then deviated, by leaving out the Words militant here in Earth: And, after his going on thus for two or three Sundays more, he was told, that it was a Thing quite new to the Congregation, and that they did not like it. He answered, *That it was an Omission without Design; and that he had no Intention to make any Alteration in the Worship.* Accordingly, for some Sundays more, he read Prayers again as directed by the Rubricks. He deviated a second Time as formerly! And being told, the Congregation were uneasy at it, he answered, *That he could not repeat the Words militant here in Earth, as directed by the Rubrick; because his Conscience forbade him, and the 9th Article of his Creed forbade him.* This made us still more uneasy, as we now suspected him inclined to the Usages. Wherefore four of the Managers went to his House, and acquainted him of this. He said, "As for the new [as " he termed them] Usages, I know nothing of them, nor shall I " ever introduce them amongst you: But, as to leaving out the " Words militant here in Earth, it is a conscientious Affair with " me; I would not repeat these Words, as directed by the Rubrick, " though the Bishop should desire me." He used many Arguments to vindicate his Opinion in that Matter; and said, *It is very strange ye should follow the English Liturgy where it is erroneous, seeing we have a much better one of our own.* Upon which he produced a printed Communion-office, (intitled, *The Communion-office, for the Use of the Church of Scotland, authorised by K. Charles I. anno 1636*), wherein the Words militant here in Earth were wanting. He affirmed, that it was a genuine Copy of the Communion-office in the Scots Liturgy; and said, *It is what I have always used for these sixteen or eighteen Years past.* The Gentlemen were not so well acquainted with the Scots Liturgy, as to pretend to gainsay what he advanced with so much Assurance; only told him, "That the Liturgy of the Church of England had always been practised amongt us; that we believed it the best, and wanted to continue with it: But, since the leaving out of these Words was a conscientious Affair with him, they believed the Congregation would, for Peace sake, agree to that Alteration, providing he would engage not to make any further Alterations or Innovations in the Worship." Upon which he held up his Hands, and in a most solemn Manner declared, *As I am a Christian, as I am a Servant of Jesus Christ, and as I hope for Salvation,*

ation, I never shall make any further Alterations or Innovations in the Worship. I would rather go to Siberia, than be an Instrument of Division, or of disturbing the Peace of the Congregation. This Declaration he then made to the Managers, and afterwards repeated it, or Words to the same Purpose, in the Meeting-house, to a general Meeting of the Heads of Families. And indeed, so solemn a Declaration satisfied most of us, that he would make no farther Innovations in the Worship: And therefore, for Peace sake, we complied with his leaving out the Words *militant here in Earth*, seeing he said it was a conscientious Affair with him. But indeed we could not well digest Mr. Robertson's Behaviour, 1. In affirming that the Communion-office he shewed the Managers, was a genuine Copy of that in the *Scots Liturgy*, when, it is to be presumed, he well knew the contrary: For, as he had dispersed several Copies through this Place, we afterwards got a Sight of it, and found it to be that spurious one taken notice of by Mr. Dundas, in his *Impartial Inquiry concerning Prayers for the Dead, &c.* p. 37. 38. 2. In first performing according to the Rubrick, then deviating; and, when asked his Reason for so doing, telling it was an Omission without Design; then performing again according to the Rubrick, and afterwards deviating a second Time.

At the above Interview, one of the Managers put the following Question to Mr. Robertson, "How far do you think the Prayers of " the Living, can any way alter or better the Souls departed in their " separate State?" To which he answered, "I am very glad to " have an Opportunity of declaring my Opinion to you in that " Matter;" and which he did in these Words: *If all Mankind would fast themselves into Skeletons, and pray till they could pray no longer, they could in no Shape alter the State of departed Souls.* How does this Declaration agree with that immediately preceding, *viz.* *I cannot repeat these Words, militant here in Earth, because my Conscience forbids me, and the ninth Article of my Creed forbids me?*

In another Conversation with Mr. Robertson, we asked him, How he came to repeat the Words *militant here in Earth* at all, seeing it was a conscientious Affair with him? He answered, "That his " Colleague Mr. Irvine desired him; and that, in so doing, he had " followed the Example of St. Paul, by becoming all things to all men, " that by all means he might gain some." We replied, That he might say of Mr. Irvine what he pleased, as he was not here to answer for himself; that he was dead, and we believed his Soul in *Heaven*: And consequently we also believed him so good a Man, so good a Christian in every respect, that he would never have desired any Man to act in contradiction to his Conscience. We reckon it a hard Reproach upon St. Paul, to say that a Man who acts contrary to his own Conscience, follows his Example. But how far

far Mr. Robertson follows the Example of St. Paul, in disturbing, disquieting, and stumbling the Consciences of such a numerous Congregation, by mangling our excellent and established Form of Worship, &c. we leave to impartial Judges to determine. But this we may say, that it would appear Mr. Robertson has not well considered these Words of St. Paul, *But when ye sin so against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, ye sin against Christ.*

The above solemn Declaration of Mr. Robertson's, not to make any further Alterations, &c. had this further Effect, That, soon after Mr. Irvine's Death, we had a Meeting of the Heads of Families; wherein it was proposed, Whether (as we were to give Mr. Goldman * an yearly Pension) we should call another Minister, as Successor to Mr. Irvine, or continue with Mr. Robertson alone, providing he will undertake the Charge? After some Reasoning *pro* and *con*, it was at last agreed by the Majority, "That we should " continue with Mr. Robertson alone; and, providing he would undertake the Charge singly, to augment his Stipend (now L. 40 " Sterling) to 1000 Merks." Accordingly the Managers were appointed to acquaint him of this; which they did. His Answer to them was, "That he had lately suffered much by Sicknes; " and, as he was now in the Decline of Life, could not undertake " the Charge singly;" but proposed we should unite with Bp Raith's Congregation. The Managers replied, "That that Proposal of his would not be agreeable to the Congregation, for several Reasons: And therefore, as he would not undertake the Charge singly, the Congregation behoved to call another Minister." He then said, "You need not be hasty in that Affair; " " for I shall try to officiate alone for some Time."

This Proposal of Mr. Robertson's, for an Union with Bp. Raith's Congregation, surprised us pretty much. The only Construction we could put upon it was, that, finding us refractory to his Innovations, he imagined, providing he could bring about the Union, that, under the Sanction of Bp Raith, he would forward his Design of proselytizing us.

At the Celebration of the Lord's Supper, Mr. Robertson did not repeat the commemorative Clause to himself, but did it to the Communicants, though much contrary to his Inclination, as afterwards appeared. The Congregation in general, thinking it an unseemly Thing, for the Pastor to take the Sacrament to himself in a Way different from that when he administered to others, a little before

* That Mr. Goldman, a pious orthodox Clergyman, had officiated as a good and faithful Pastor for many Years amongst us; and being now, through Age and Infirmity, unable to officiate, we reckoned it our Duty to settle an yearly Pension during his Life.

Easter, the Managers were desired to wait on Mr. Robertson at his own House, and earnestly intreat, in Name of the whole Congregation, that, for the Sake of Peace and Uniformity, he would please condescend to take it to himself with the *commemorative Clause*. This the Managers did; but no Intreaties, no Solicitations, would prevail.

Immediately before *Easter*, Mr Robertson had six Days of publick Catechising in the Meeting-house; during which, he several Times inculcated this Doctrine, *viz.* *When we poor Mortals commit Sin, the Saints in Heaven are grieved at it, and pray to God to forgive us.*

Now, we think this was inculcating a Doctrine which is not revealed in holy Scripture; consequently, this was *intruding into those Things which he hath not seen!* Nay, we think this Doctrine contradictory to the Words of Scripture, where it is expressly declared, *Isaiah lxiii. 16.* That *Abraham, and consequently all the Saints in Heaven, are ignorant of us, and know nothing of our Condition.* How then can they know when we commit Sin, and so be grieved at it, and pray to God to forgive us? If we suppose them acquainted with our State; what is this, but to ascribe to them that Ubiquity and Omnipresence, which is solely, peculiarly, and incommunicably in God? And, if they are always present with us, how naturally will it follow, that we may desire them, as we do our Fellow-Christians here, to recommend our particular Cases to God? If then Mr. Robertson's Doctrine be true, here is a fair Foundation laid for that most absurd Doctrine of the *Papists, the Invocation of Saints*, a Tenet embraced by several of the *Usage-party*, as may easily be proved by their Writings.

On *Easter-day*, Mr. Robertson (notwithstanding his solemn Promise not to make any further Innovations in the Worship) used a Prayer of Consecration different from what was ever practised amongst us. The Words were, (after going on with the Prayer as in the Liturgy):—*And of thy Almighty Goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy holy Gifts and Creatures of Bread and Wine, WHICH WE NOW OFFER UNTO THEE, that we receiving, &c.* We are pretty sure, that such a Prayer of Consecration is not to be found in any of the Reformed Liturgies, not even in K. Edward VI.'s first Liturgy, which Mr. Robertson, and all the *Usage-Clergy*, not only commend as far preferable to the present Liturgy, but exclaim heavily against all those who had any Hand in altering it. Nay, Bp Raitt and Mr. Robertson both told us, *That all the Alterations and Reviews it had suffered, were each of them so much to the worse.*

We will not take upon us to make a Comparison betwixt King Edward's first Liturgy, and our present excellent Form; that we must leave to an abler Pen: But thus far we may say with Assurance,

at his
ongre-
please
Clause.
would
ublick
Times
in, the
s.
not re-
to those
e con-
clared,
nts in
dition.
rieved
uaint-
Ub-
mmu-
ow na-
r Fel-
God ?
dation
ion of
ay ea-

on Pro-
(p) u-
oracti-
Prayer
o bless
s and
UNTO
uch a
formed
n Mr.
r pre-
those
Robert-
suffer-

King
at we
Affu-
rance,

rance, that the learned Bodies of Men, who made the several *Reviews*, knew as much of Antiquity, knew as much of the Religion of the holy Scriptures, and knew as well how to worship God in *Spirit and in Truth*, as either Bp *Raitt* or Mr. *Robertson*.

We must here again take notice of Mr. *Robertson*'s Insincerity ; we have already seen his disingenuous Behaviour, about leaving out the Words *militant here in Earth*, and in his affirming a spurious Copy of the *Scots Communion-office* to be a genuine one, when, it is most natural and reasonable to believe, he knew the contrary ! And is it not very surprising, that, after so solemn a Declaration to the contrary, he should thus go on with his Innovations ?

Wherefore we cannot help remarking, that this Behaviour of Mr. *Robertson*'s is quite agreeable to that *Jesuitical Maxim*, viz. That a Man may *equivocate*, may *dissemble*, &c. &c. providing he thereby forward the Interest and Advantage of his Party !

We think such a *Tenet* destructive of all Truth and Honesty between Man and Man ; destructive of that sacred Rule, *Not to do evil that good may come*. Nay, it is to *continue in sin, that grace may abound*. And further, it is in a manner declaring, that their Religion cannot be supported by Truth ; which is saying the worst that can be said of any Religion !

The least Transgression of God's Law must not be adventured on, upon any the most Christian Design or Consideration. It is certain, that the least Degree of *Equivocation* or *Diffimulation* is contrary to Truth; consequently a Transgression of God's Law ; and therefore an Abomination to the God of Truth.

Mr. *Robertson*'s Behaviour gave very great Offence to our Congregation. We now considered him as one on whose Promise we could not rely ; and by this Time had discovered him to be a real Abettor of the *Usages*. Finding we were so much offended at his Innovations, &c. he, (in order to carry on his Designs more successfully), with those he had proselyted, laboured hard to bring about his projected *Union*. Accordingly Bp *Raitt*'s Managers told those of our House, that they had some Proposals to make, for an *Union* of the two Congregations ; and therefore desired a Meeting.

The 10th April, the Heads of Families in our Congregation were desired to stay in the Meeting-house after the Afternoon's Worship ; when our Managers acquainted us of what those of Bp *Raitt*'s House desired. It was agreed, That Peace and Unity amongst all Men was most desirable, and what every good Christian should wish for, and endeavour to promote : That we were willing to make an *Union* on reasonable Terms ; viz. Providing Bp *Raitt* would promise, *we should have publick Worship according to the Liturgy of the Church of England*. The few of Mr. *Robertson*'s Proselytes argued, That we ought, without Hesitation, to agree to the

Union,

Union, and rely upon the Bishop for the Form of Worship. We, on the other hand, were not ignorant of the Way and Manner of Bp Raitt's coming into this Place, the Year 1727, and making a Division * or Separation in the Congregation: We knew, that the Causes of that Separation still subsisted, *viz.* That Bp Raitt had refused to sign the *Formula* against the *Usages*; nay, that he was really an Encourager and Promoter of them; and that he made *Innovations* in the publick Worship, particularly in the Communion-office: Therefore it was insisted on by some, that we ought to make no *Union*, as we were not to expect that Bp Raitt would alter his Manner of performing publick Worship; at least, if we were to make one, it ought to be *conditional*. They again said, That to propose *Conditions*, was to prescribe Rules to our Superiors. We replied, That we did not pretend to prescribe Rules; the Conditions we claimed were what the Church ordered, (*viz.* That the Worship be performed as directed by the Rubricks); and we thought, that Bishops, as well as Presbyters, ought to be subject to the *Canons* and *Constitutions* of the Church. After some Arguings *pro* and *con*, it was at last agreed, That we should have a Meeting with Bp Raitt's Managers, to hear what they had to say. And it being told us, that the Committee of Bp Raitt's House consisted of nine, it was proposed, we should name the like Number. Accordingly a Committee (*viz.* the five Managers, with four others) was appointed, to meet with the Committee of Bp Raitt's House, to bear what Proposals they had to make for an *Union* of the two Congregations, and to make a Report to a general Meeting. The next Day, the two Committees had a Meeting. The Proposal made by the Committee of Bp Raitt's House was, "That, in order to an *Union* of the two Houses, they desired our Congregation would agree, That the Ministers should officiate in one another's Houses, 'till such Time as a House, sufficient to accommodate both Congregations, could be got." To which our Committee answered, "That Bp Raitt might read Prayers or preach in our Meeting-house when he pleased, and might order Mr. Robertson to do the same in his House, without asking the Concurrence of our Congregation; therefore they could not but agree to that which he might do of himself, without asking our Consent." To which they replied, "But the Bishop does not incline to do so, without the Consent of your Congregation." Our Committee rejoined, "We believe our Congregation will agree, that Bp Raitt may read Prayers or preach in our Meeting-house when he pleases,

* From the Revolution, till the Year 1727, there was but one Episcopal Congregation in Dundee; at which Time, Mr. James Raitt, now Bp Raitt, divided it, or rather did tear it asunder.

“ ses, and may order Mr. Robertson to do the same in his own Meeting-house.” Bp Raitt’s Committee proposed, there should be a signed Minute of this Meeting; which was accordingly done as follows. “ *Dundee, 11th April 1743.* The Managers of the *Seagate* Meeting-house, with the four following Gentlemen, [naming them], being commissioned by a general Meeting of this Congregation yesterday to meet with the Managers of the Bishop’s Meeting-house, and to know from them what Proposals they had to make for the *Union* of the two Houses; the said Managers accordingly met, and proposed for the *Union* of the two Congregations, That the Ministers should officiate in one another’s Houses, till such Time as a House could be fallen upon, that would accommodate the whole Congregation. To which Proposal, the Managers of the *Seagate* Meeting-house, and the above Gentlemen, unanimously agreed.”

At this Meeting, Bp Raitt’s Committee were pleased to tell ours, That they were surprised to hear our Congregation hesitated about the *Union*, and proposed *Conditions*; which was in a manner to prescribe Rules. They said, we ought to trust the Bishop, who had always continued uniform in the publick Worship, and had very lately declared, *he had no Mind to alter, unless the Bishops, in a synodical Meeting, should think fit to make a Review of the Liturgy.* To this was given much such a Return as is mentioned above, to Mr. Robertson’s Proselytes, at the Meeting of our own Congregation the Day before.

From the above Minute of Sederunt, it is evident, that our Committee exceeded their Powers, which were, *To hear the Proposals of the other House, and to make a Report*; but not to hear and determine. And indeed the Congregation, in general, were much displeased at this Procedure of their Committee: And when our Manager who wrote and signed the above Minute of Sederunt, asked the other Managers to meet with him, in order to have it inserted in our Book, they would by no means consent to it; but, on the contrary, told him, they were sensible that the Committee had exceeded their Powers, and that the Minute of Sederunt should not be inserted in our Book, as it was no Deed of the Congregation’s, and as they were sure the Congregation would not agree to it.

However, Mr. Robertson’s Party amongst us, and all Bp Raitt’s Congregation, made a great Handle of this Minute for carrying on the *Union*. For, at a general Meeting of our Congregation some time thereafter, Mr. Robertson’s Party proposes, “ That, as the two Committees had made such an Agreement, the Meeting should immediately appoint a Committee, who, in conjunction with Bp Raitt’s Managers, might settle upon a House, or a Spot of Ground whereon to build one, sufficient to accommodate both

“ Con-

“ Congregations.” But they found no Manner of Encouragement. For, amongst several other Arguments against the projected *Union*, we asked them, “ What have been our Objections all along against “ Mr. Raitt? Are these Objections removed? nay, do they not “ visibly subsist? Are they not known to us all, and have we not “ fresh Instances of their subsisting? Consequently, we have “ still the same, if not more and greater Reasons, for not uniting “ with his Congregation now, than we have had for these sixteen “ or seventeen Years past. And, till these Objections are remo- “ ved, we ought not; nay we cannot, consistently with our avowed “ Principles, make an *Union*.”

Again, we told them, “ That it was currently reported, and we “ were credibly informed of it, by a Letter from *Edinburgh*, that “ there was to be a synodical Meeting of the Bishops at *Edinburgh*, “ some time in *June*, in order to make a Review of the Liturgy; “ and therefore we were altogether against making any Step to- “ wards an *Union*, till we should see the Issue of that Meeting.” These Reasonings (as the Generality agreed to them) effectually de- determined the Meeting to come to no Conclusion as to any Step to- wards an *Union*.

But Mr. Robertson’s Party insisting upon appointing a Committee as above, and that the Managers should be the Persons named; it was answered, “ That the Managers, if they had a Mind to take “ any Trouble about looking out for a House, or about building “ one, they might; but we thought it was like *driving the Cart* “ *before the Horse*, to take any manner of Trouble about a House, “ till such time as there was a real *Union*.” And thus stands the projected *Union*.

After this Minute of the 11th *April*, Bp *Raitt* and Mr. *Robertson* read Prayers and preached alternately in the two Houses, (which our Congregation, notwithstanding their being much displeased at the Procedure of the Committee, did not oppose). And indeed they seemed to think the *Union* in a manner concluded: For Mr. *Robertson*, in a private Conversation, acquainted the Manager who wrote and signed the Minute, that the Bishop had ordered, that the holy Communion should be given in one Meeting-house only at a Time; and that, at the ensuing Festival of *Whitsunday*, it was to be given in our House; which he desired him to communicate to our other Managers. Accordingly he did so. And their Return to him was, That they were absolutely against such a Proceeding, as they were sure it would not be agreeable to our Congregation; and that for the Reasons before mentioned. He acquainted Mr. *Robertson* of this; who, notwithstanding our strongest Remonstrances, intimated it from the Pulpit the 15th *May*; when he was pleased to say, “ That, “ as there was now an *Union* of the two Congregations, the Bishop

“ de-

" designed that the holy Sacrament of our Lord's Supper should be administered alternately in the two Houses; and that, at the ensuing Festival, it was to be done in this (*viz.* our) House." This Intimation gave us very great Uneasiness. We were conscious to ourselves that there was no *Union*, and that we never intended one but upon the Conditions before mentioned. Our Congregation could not comply with Bp *Raitt's Innovations* in the Communion-office: And therefore, though we did not oppose his reading Prayers or preaching in our Meeting-house, we could not agree to his administering the holy Communion to us, except he performed according to the Form of the Church of *England*. Mr. *Robertson* was acquainted of this; and at the same time it was told him, that this Step of Bp *Raitt's* and his, was doing a great Injury to our Congregation; that it was doing Violence to our Consciences. But all we could say was to no Purpose: For Bp *Raitt*, with those of his Congregation that were to communicate, assembled in our Meeting-house on *Whitsunday*.

Now, as to this Procedure of Bp *Raitt's* and Mr. *Robertson's*, we believe that all orthodox Christians will agree with the learned Mr. *Chillingworth*, when he says, *I have learned from the ancient Fathers of the Church, that nothing is more against Religion, than to force Religion.*

How far Bp *Raitt* could thus force himself on our Congregation, contrary to the Advice and earnest Solicitation of four to one of the Managers, and almost the general Voice of the Congregation, we must leave to proper and impartial Judges to determine. In the mean time it is evident, that he and Mr. *Robertson* put a Force upon us: We were obliged either to abstract ourselves, to leave our own proper House and Place of Worship, or to comply with what we believed erroneous. But we chose the former; at least most of us did so: For, to have gone about the most solemn Part of Worship with a doubting Mind, would have been a strange Procedure.

We say, without Breach of Charity, that Bp *Raitt* knew most of us would be obliged to abstract ourselves upon this his Procedure: How then can he vindicate himself from acting a Part inconsistent with the Precepts of the Gospel, which teacheth, *That no man put a stumbling-block, or an occasion to fall, in his brother's way?* Rom. xiv. 13. *Giving no offence in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed,* 2 Cor. vi. 3.

Here we cannot help mentioning, with Applause, the Behaviour of a Gentlewoman of our Congregation, *viz.* When Bp *Raitt* was delivering to her the consecrated Bread without the *commemorative Clause*, (which was a Thing quite new to her), she paused a little, then took it, and repeated these Words so as she was distinctly

ly heard, I take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for me; may I feed on him in my Heart by Faith with Thanksgiving.

Why Bp Raitt and all the Usage-Divines leave out the Words in the commemorative Clause, seeing they are quite agreeable to our Saviour's own Words, we cannot comprehend; unless it be for the same Reason that the Roman Church leaveth them out, viz. Because they favour a commemorative, and not a true real propitiatory and expiatory Sacrifice.

But (with Submission to the Clergy) let us inquire a little into the Form of Words used by the Church of England in the Administration, viz.

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy Heart by Faith with Thanksgiving. And,

The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

Dr. Comber divides each of these into three Parts, viz. 1. *The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee.* 2. *Preserve thy Body and Soul unto everlasting Life.* 3. *Take and eat this in remembrance, &c.* The third Part we call the commemorative Clause. Of which the Doctor says, *The Words in this Part have for their Author Christ himself, who did administer in these Words: And, if we should leave them out, (as the Roman Church doth), we should have but half his Form.* And, of the whole three Parts, the Doctor says, "And if we do well consider the whole Frame, it appears to be "nothing else but a necessary Paraphrase upon our Saviour's Words, "which doth expound and fit them for every one's private Medi- "tations."

We beg leave to ask the Usage-Divines this Question, Whether the Commemoration or Remembrance, with the highest Gratitude and Thankfulness our Souls are capable of, of the inestimable Benefits purchased to Mankind by the Death and Sufferings of Jesus Christ, is not one principal End of the Institution of this Ordinance? If it is, why should not frail Mortals be put in mind of their Duty, especially as it is so directed by the *Institutor?* For it is most evident, that the above Form is exactly agreeable to our Saviour's own Words, viz. *Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me, 1 Cor. xi. 24.* Now, whose Precepts are we to obey? whose Example are we to follow in our Christian Duties, and particularly in this most solemn Part of Christian Worship? Are we to search into the *Writings and Traditions* of frail Men, and be guided and directed by them, preferably to so plain

plain a Precept and Example of him *who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life!*

Now, as this holy Sacrament was an Institution of our blessed Lord's, it was also his Command, That his Servants should continue to do as he did. And therefore, in imitation of that blessed Example, and in obedience to that divine Command, the Church of *England*, in her excellent Liturgy, directs the *commemorative Clause* in the Form of Administration.

Being now fully persuaded that Mr. *Robertson* was endeavouring all he could to crush our Religion, and to introduce a different Persuasion amongst us, we therefore reckoned it our Duty to use all lawful Means in order to put a Stop to all his *Innovations*. Accordingly a general Meeting of the Heads of Families was called the 25th May 1743: The Result of which was, That, as we had, by repeated Solicitations, earnestly intreated Mr. *Robertson* to make no *Innovations* in the publick Worship; as he had actually practised the Liturgy as directed by the Rubricks, several Times after his Settlement; as it was from a firm Belief and Persuasion he was to continue to do so, that we signed a Call to him; and that, notwithstanding his solemn Declaration to the contrary, he still continued to *innovate*! it was therefore unanimously agreed, that four of our Number be appointed to wait upon Bp *Raitt*, earnestly to intreat him, in name of the Congregation, to lay his Commands on Mr. *Robertson* to practise the Liturgy of the Church of *England* as directed by the Rubricks. The four Gentlemen were accordingly named. The 28th they waited upon Bp *Raitt* at his House, and the 30th made to a general Meeting their Report, in Substance as follows:

"That they waited upon Bp *Raitt*, and represented to him, That "it was the utmost Wish and Desire of our Congregation to continue in the Communion of the Church of *England*; and therefore "they, in name of our Congregation, intreated he would please lay "his Commands on Mr. *Robertson* to practise the Liturgy of that "Church, as we have always had it before he came amongst us.
"In answer to which Bp *Raitt* said, he could lay no such Command on Mr. *Robertson*, as he thought it would be inconsistent with the *Concordate* made anno 1731; wherein (as he said) it was left to the Discretion of any Pastor to use, in his Congregation, either the *Scots* or *English* Liturgy: But, at the same time, added, "that he would lay no Restriction on Mr. *Robertson*, but leave it to himself to comply with our Request, or not, as he pleased.

"Mr. *Robertson* being present, was asked and intreated to comply with our earnest Request. He answered, *That he was not a Presbyter of the Church of England, and therefore would not practise that Liturgy as we desired: That he thought it right to give the holy*

“ Communion without the commemorative Clause: and, That he would not take the Sacrament to himself with that Clause, nor repeat the Words militant here in Earth, as directed by the Rubrick, though the Bishop should desire him. And besides, That he would not even comply with the Scots Liturgy!”

This Report surprised the Meeting greatly. It is true, it was not very surprising to hear that Mr. Robertson had absolutely declared he would comply with neither English nor Scots Liturgy: But indeed we were greatly surprised to hear that Mr. Robertson made such a Declaration in the Bishop’s House, and in his Presence, without getting the least Reproof.

After some Reasoning, the following Sederunt was made out, *viz.*

“ The Meeting, after considering the above Report, find, That Bp Raitt has hitherto laid no Restrictions on Mr. Robertson; but that he leaves it to himself to comply with the Congregation or not as he pleases: They therefore resolve, That, unless Mr. Robertson will practise the Liturgy of the Church of England, (as it was always practised amongst them before he officiated in their Congregation), they shall reckon themselves quite free from any Engagements they can ly under to him in virtue of their Call; as it was entirely upon the Faith of his doing so, that made them sign a Call to him. They think themselves bound in Conscience and Christian Duty to ask this Compliance from Mr. Robertson; and they will think it strange if he refuse to comply, especially as he performed publick Worship several Times, upon his Settlement, as directed by the Rubricks in said Liturgy. Besides, they beg Mr. Robertson seriously to consider, whether it will be consistent with the Duty and Office of a Minister of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, thus to remain amongst them, contrary to the general Inclination and Desire of the Congregation, and thereby stumble and offend their Consciences, divide and tear their Congregation to Pieces, and, in short, to make them miserable in place of happy.

“ The Meeting appoint this Sederunt to be intimated immediately to Mr. Robertson, by the foresaid four Gentlemen; who are, in name of the Congregation, again to intreat his Compliance; and withal to acquaint him, that, in case of his refusing to comply, they will forthwith proceed to call another Minister to the Congregation, as a Successor to Mr. Irvine.”

Accordingly the four Gentlemen waited upon Mr. Robertson at his own House, read the above Minute of Sederunt, and represented to him, “ That, as Bp Raitt had laid no Restrictions upon him, he was quite at Liberty to comply with the reasonable, just and earnest Request of our Congregation; and therefore intreated his Compliance.” He shunned giving a direct Return; but asked the

the Gentlemen, "Are you in Communion with Bp *Raitt*?" To which they answered, "We wish well to all Mankind. We are in Communion with Bp *Raitt*, as far as he is in Communion with the Church: But, since he makes a real Breach of our Standard of publick Worship the Terms of communicating with him, and thereby stumbles and offends our Consciences, it is no wonder we do not join him." "Then, [said he], as you are not in Union and Communion with the Bishop, I am not at Freedom to practise either *English*, *Scots*, or any other Liturgy amongst you." After a little more arguing, the Gentlemen said, "We must return to our Constituents, who wait us, to whom we must report, that you refuse to comply with the Request of the Congregation." As they were going to the Door, he asked them to stay; and said, "Gentlemen, you cannot make such a Report, for I have not refused a Compliance;" and immediately began to argue in his usual Manner. The Gentlemen replied, "We were not sent here to argue, but to ask you a single Question; and therefore again desire you will please give a direct Return." Which, after some more Reasoning and earnest Solicitation, he shunned to give.

The four Gentlemen having reported this to the Meeting, "They immediately appointed a Committee, with Power to settle upon a proper Person for a Minister to the Congregation in place of Mr. *Ir-vine*; which done, to make their Report, that the Congregation might proceed directly to a Call."

Here we cannot help making a Remark on Mr. *Robertson*'s Behaviour. We have mentioned our Offer to him, of augmenting his Stipend, providing he would undertake the Charge alone: That he then told us he could not do that; and therefore proposed we should unite with Bp *Raitt*'s Congregation: But being told that that Proposal of his would not be agreeable to us, and that we behoved to call another Minister, seeing he would not undertake the Charge singly; he then said, *we needed not be hasty in that Affair; for he would try to officiate alone for some time.* What other Construction can we put upon such a Behaviour but this? *viz.* He easily saw we were displeased at his *Innovations*; he knew we were deceived and disappointed in our Choice of him, and, consequently, that we would use more Caution in endeavouring to find a Pastor of the same Communion with ourselves; and that, if we should succeed in this, he foresaw his Design of proselyting us would be frustrated. That he therefore used such a Method, in order to gain Time, so as he might make a sufficient Number on his Side.

Just so here: When he found we were in earnest about calling another Minister, he would not flatly deny a Compliance with our Request, but always shunned giving a direct Answer; which we must conclude to be with no other View than still to gain Time:

For,

For, though he said, *I am not at Freedom to practise either English, Scots, or any Liturgy amongst you*; yet it is certain that Bp Raitt and he continued to officiate alternately in our Meeting-houſe, for ſeven or eight Weeks after this, viz. till the 24th July, when Mr. Fife ſettled amongst us.

The 11th of June, (being the usual Day for chusing Managers), a general Meeting of the Heads of Families was called, in order to chuse Managers for the ensuing Year. The ordinary Number formerly was four, with a Treasurer, who is also a Manager; but, by reaſon of our present unlucky and troublous Situation, it was thought proper to name ſix, with a Treasurer; which was accordingly done.

After the Nomination of Managers, "The Meeting recommended to the Committee appointed for ſettling upon another Minister in place of Mr. *Irvine*, to use all poſſible Diligence in that Affair."

Indeed the above Meeting had good Reaſon to deſire the Committee to use all poſſible Diligence in finding out a proper Successor to Mr. *Irvine*; for, by this Time, Mr. *Robertſon*, in his Inter-course amongst us, had (besides his *Innovations* in the publick Worſhip) deviated ſo far from what we reckon the Rules or Principles of real Integrity, that moſt of us had conceived ſuch an Opinion of him, as that we thought we could not be benefited by his Miniftrations. And here we are to acquaint our Reader, that, having been ſo ſtrangely uſed and deſeived by Mr. *Robertſon*, we made a *Reſolution*, not to call any for our Minister, but who would ſatisfy us under his Hand, that he would praetice the Liturgy of the Church of *England* without *Innovations*.

Some Days after this, viz. about the 18th of June, it being publickly known amongst us, that the Minute of Sederunt made by the two Committees the 11th April, as narrated p. 15. had been pri- vately inserted in our Book; we were greatly displeased at ſo clandestine a Deed. We were certain that it was not inserted before the 11th of June: We were convinced that it was a Contrivance of Mr. *Robertſon's*, and that it was done with a Design to fix his projected *Union* upon us: And we are perſuaded, that he who inserted it, would not have acted ſuch a Part, had he not been imposed upon! So true is the Observation, *Evil Counſel will make a good Man do a wrong Thing*.

As we were highly offendea at this Proceeding, a general Meeting of the Heads of Families was called the 24th, to conſider of that Affair; at which were preſent the Majority of our Committee: who owned they had, in that Affair, exceeded the Powers granted them, and were ready to ſuffer a Reprimand. The Meeting, after conſidering the Matter, made out the following Sederunt.

" The

" The Meeting, taking into their Consideration a Minute of Se-
 " derunt, dated the 11th April last, and very lately and clandestine-
 " ly inserted in their Book, by which they find, that the then Ma-
 " nagers, with four others added to them, as a Committee appoint-
 " ed by a general Meeting, held in the Meeting-house the 10th
 " April, to meet with the Managers of Bp Raitt's Meeting-house,
 " to know from them what Proposals they had to make for an U-
 " nion of the two Houses, and to make a Report to a general Meet-
 " ing ; had, without making any Report, agreed, *That the Mini-
 " sters should officiate in one another's Houses, until such time as a House
 " could be fallen upon that would accommodate the whole (as it is called
 " in their Minute) Congregation :* By which the said Committee
 " have acted most unwarrantably, by exceeding the Powers grant-
 " ed them by the foresaid general Meeting ; being only, *To meet
 " with the Managers of the other House, to hear their Proposals, and
 " to make a Report ; but not to hear and determine !* And there-
 " upon the Meeting, reasoning amongst themselves, stated a Vote,
 " Reverse or not the foresaid Agreement of the above Committee ;
 " and it carried by a very great Majority, *Reverse* : And therefore
 " the Meeting reversed and rescinded the foresaid Agreement, as
 " done by their Committee without their Consent ; and hereby de-
 "clare it to be void and null, with all that has followed or may
 " follow thereupon."

To the above Meeting, the Committee appointed for settling up-
 on a proper Successor to Mr. *Irvine*, reported, " That they had seve-
 " ral times conferred with the Rev. Mr. *David Fife* Minister of an
 " Episcopal Congregation at *Glenboy and Glamis* ; that Mr. *Fife* had
 " agreed to accept of a Call from our Congregation ; and that he
 " had satisfied them under his Hand to practise the Liturgy of the
 " Church of *England* without *Innovations*."

The Meeting, as most of them were well acquainted with Mr.
Fife, and being quite satisfied of his orthodox Principles, " Agreed
 " that Mr. *Fife* would be acceptable to the Congregation ; and
 " therefore appointed three of their Number to draw up a Call for
 " him."

Our Call to Mr. *Fife* being made out, a general Meeting was cal-
 led the 4th *July*. The Meeting (all except one) approved of, and
 signed the Call ; " And recommended to the Managers to get it
 " signed by the absent Members : Which done, to present it to
 " Bp *Raitt*, and desire, in name of the Congregation, his Concur-
 " rence for Mr. *Fife*'s Settlement amongst us, as one of our Mini-
 " sters, and as Successor to Mr. *Irvine*. "

A Transcript of the Call.

WE the Managers and other Members of the *Seagate* Meeting-house in *Dundee*, subscribing, taking into our serious Consideration, that there is a Vacancy in our said Meeting-house, by the Death of the Rev. Mr. *James Irvine* our late Pastor, think it most necessary and expedient, that a proper Minister, who will practise the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, (as always formerly done in our Congregation), should be called to succeed him. And we, being well assured of the steady, sound, and orthodox Principles of the Rev. Mr. *David Fife* Minister of an Episcopal Congregation at *Glenboy*, have all agreed to call the said Mr. *David Fife* to be our Minister: And therefore we earnestly desire and hereby request the said Rev. Mr. *David Fife* to accept of this our Call. We promise him all dutiful Respect and Regard; and we hereby bind and oblige ourselves to give him forty Pounds *Sterling* of yearly Stipend, and all other due Encouragement during his officiating amongst us. And we hereby empower our present Managers to present this our Call to the said Mr. *David Fife*, and to do every thing requisite and necessary for settling him as our Minister. In witness whereof, these Presents are written upon stamped Paper, by *Peter Kininmond* Writer in *Dundee*, and subscribed by us, at *Dundee*, this fourth Day of *July*, One thousand seven hundred and forty four Years.

We are here to acquaint our Reader, that this Call is signed by all the seven Managers, and fourscore others besides.

The 15th *July*, five of the Managers waited upon Bp *Raitt* with our Call to Mr. *Fife*; and that same Day reported to a general Meeting, "That they presented the Call, with Mr. *Fife*'s Acceptance; both which the Bishop read: That they, in consequence of said Call and Acceptance, craved, in name of the Congregation, his Concurrence for Mr. *Fife*'s Settlement in our Meeting-house, as one of our Ministers, and as Successor to Mr. *Irvine*: That he absolutely refused his Concurrence: That they asked, if he had any Objection to Mr. *Fife*'s Life or Conversation, to his Doctrine or Sufficiency? That he made no Objection to either: That his only Reason for not concurring in Mr. *Fife*'s Settlement was, *That there was*, as he was pleased to say, *an Union of the two Meeting-houses*; *that he himself was our Minister in place of Mr. Irvine*; *that Mr. Robertson and he were Colleagues*; and, *consequently, that there was no Vacancy in our Meeting-house*. In answer to which they said, That we could not reckon him our Minister in place of Mr. *Irvine*, as we had given him no Call or Invitation: That they were quite conscious to themselves there was no *Union*; and that our Congregation, in a general Meeting, "had,

“ had, for very good Reasons, declared so, by a publick Deed :
 “ They therefore again, in name of the Congregation, craved his
 “ Concurrence in the Settlement. That Bp *Raitt* still insisted upon
 “ the *Union*, and on his being our Minister in place of Mr. *Irv-*
 “ *ine* ; and was pleased to say, with some *Emotion*, *I am so far*
 “ *from concurring in the Settlement, that, if Mr. Fife shall presume to*
 “ *come and settle amongst you, I will proceed against him with the*
 “ *biggest Censures.*”

This Report surprised the Meeting very much. They reasoned thus, That we are undoubted Patrons: That we may call as many regularly well qualified Ministers as we please, providing we can afford them a suitable Maintenance: That our Meeting-house has always been collegiate: That there is now a Vacancy; to supply which we have given a regular Call, which is regularly accepted: That all the seven Managers, and above five sixths of the Congregation are consenting to this Call: That Bp *Raitt* made no Objection to Mr. *Fife*'s Life or Conversation, Doctrine or Sufficiency; as to his Objection of the *Union*, and of his being our Minister in place of Mr. *Irvine*, it is such as can never abide the Test: That therefore we must naturally conclude, Bp *Raitt*'s only Objection, at Bottom, against Mr. *Fife*, is, That Mr. *Fife* signed the *Formula* against the *Usages*, has all along opposed them, and always declared himself to be of the Communion of the Church of *England*: That, providing the Episcopal Church were now in a flourishing Condition, and supposing Mr. *Raitt* vested with all the Powers and Privileges of a regular Diocesan Bishop, in such a Case, the Law would have obliged him to have concurred in Mr. *Fife*'s Settlement: That, since the Episcopal Church has been under Cloud, many worthy Pastors have settled in Congregations at *Edinburgh* and in other Places, without any Concurrence from a Bishop, and enjoyed their Settlements peaceably: That as our present surviving Pastor, Mr. *Robertson*, has behaved in such a manner amongst us, as makes us really believe him no Friend to the Reformation-principles, and consequently cannot with Pleasure or Satisfaction attend his Ministrations; on the other hand, as many of us have been long and well acquainted with Mr. *Fife*, as we are quite satisfied of his Principles, and can entirely confide in him; we must look upon it, as a high Encroachment upon our Liberties and Privileges, and a real arbitrary Act in Bp *Raitt* thus to endeavour to deprive us of him. In short, we were now convinced, that Bp *Raitt* and Mr. *Robertson* were conspiring together, either to force us into their Way of thinking, or, by any means, to distress us. The Meeting, after thus reasoning among themselves, made out the following Sederunt.

“ The Meeting, after considering the above Report, &c. cannot
 “ help declaring their Opinion, (and they are sorry for having Rea-
 D “ son

“ son to do so), that Bp *Raitt's* refusing his Concurrence in the Settlement must proceed mostly, if not altogether, from *Prejudice* and *Partiality*; and therefore, after separately calling the Opinion of each Person present, they unanimously agree to take Mr. *Fife* for their settled Minister, providing he will come as such; and if (after his Settlement amongst us) Bp *Raitt* should proceed against him with his highest Censures of Deposition, &c. the Meeting (as they humbly apprehend such Censures, proceeding upon such Grounds, would really be unjust in themselves, and that unjust Censures can hurt no Man) hereby unanimously resolve to support Mr. *Fife*, to adhere to him as our Minister, by frequenting his Minististrations, &c. and to fulfil our Engagements in our Call to him.

“ The Meeting appoint the Managers to intimate this Sederunt to Mr. *Fife*; and to tell him, that our Congregation expect he will preach in their Meeting-house the 24th instant.

“ The Meeting also appoint the Managers (after getting a Return from Mr. *Fife*, and if therewith his Consent to settle and preach as above desired) to acquaint Mr. *Robertson*, that Mr. *Fife* is to preach and perform publick Worship in our Meeting-house the 24th, as one of our settled Ministers; and, at the same time, again to intreat Mr. *Robertson*, in the most earnest Manner, to comply with the reasonable Request of the Congregation.”

The 22d *July*, Mr. *Fife* being come to Town, in order to settle amongst us, and to perform publick Worship the 24th, two of the Managers went to Mr. *Robertson's* House, and acquainted him, “ That Mr. *Fife* was to officiate in our Meeting-house next *Sunday*, as one of our settled Ministers, and as his Colleague. They intreated him, in the most pathetick Manner they could, to comply with the reasonable and just Request of the Congregation, viz. *To practise the Liturgy of the Church of England as directed by the Rubricks.* They told him, that his so doing would give the greatest Pleasure and Satisfaction to the Congregation; it would restore that Peace and Harmony which subsisted amongst them before he began with his *Innovations*; it would throw in Oblivion all Mistakes, &c. that had happened betwixt him and them; it would make them love and respect him as their good Pastor, they would joyfully embrace him with open Arms, and do every Thing in their Power to oblige him.” These and other such Arguments the Gentlemen used; but all in vain: For he neither said he would, or would not comply; but began to argue in much the same Strain as mentioned p. 21. by asking, *Are you in Communion with the Bishop?* To which the Gentlemen replied in almost the same Words as mentioned p. 21. Then, said he, *Since you are not in Union and Communion with Bp Raitt, I cannot*

cannot be your Minister. So they were obliged to leave him without further Satisfaction.

The 23d July, Bp Raitt sent and acquainted Mr. Fife, that he would willingly see him at his House that Day. Accordingly Mr. Fife, attended by two Gentlemen of our Congregation, waited on Bp Raitt that Afternoon. The mutual Compliments were scarce over, when Mr. Robertson pulled out some Papers, and told Mr. Fife, "he wanted to let him see how our Congregation had most "unwarrantably deposed him." To which Mr. Fife answered, "I "am sure that Congregation never pretended, or ever designed a "ny such Thing: For yesterday, I witnessed two of the Mana "gers being deputed to wait on you, and to acquaint you, that I "was to officiate next Sunday in their Meeting-house, as one of their "settled Ministers, and as your Colleague; and at the same Time "most earnestly, in name of the whole Congregation, to intreat "you to comply with their just and reasonable Request, *viz.* To "practise the Liturgy of the Church of England as directed by "the Rubricks." To this Bp Raitt replied, *That Mr. Robertson could not practise that Liturgy, or any other Form of divine Service among them, as they were Schismatics.* The two Gentlemen took this Expression so much amiss that, after giving Bp Raitt a suitable Return, they went out. Mr. Fife staid a little, to whom Bp Raitt said, *I am informed you are to take Possession of Mr. Robertson's Pulpit To-morrow.* Mr. Fife answered, *I am to invade no Man's Right. I have got a very regular and ample Call from the Congregation to be one of their Ministers, as Successor to Mr. Irvine. I have regularly accepted, and, in consequence, am come to settle in their Meeting-house as such, and as Colleague to Mr. Robertson.* To which Bp Raitt replied, *There being an Union betwixt the two Congregations, I am Mr. Irvine's Successor, and Mr. Robertson's Colleague; so that there is no Vacancy in their Meeting-house.* To this Mr. Fife rejoined, *I evidently see from their Books, that the projected Union is really no Union; the Minute of Sederunt relative to it, and unwarrantably agreed to by their Committee, being rescinded, and declared null and void, by a general Meeting of the Congregation.* After some more Reasoning about the Union, Bp Raitt asked Mr. Fife, *What are you to do To-morrow?* To which Mr. Fife replied, *I shall take it to advise till that Time;* and immediately went away.

The 24th July, being Sunday, the Managers, with some others, attended Mr. Fife to the Meeting-house. A little Time after, Mr. Robertson (though he had, two Days before, said, *he could not be our Minister*; and though Bp Raitt, the Day before, had told, *he could not practise any Form of divine Service among us*) came in with his Gown on as usual. The Gentleman (a present Manager) who attended at the Door, made way for him, and opened

his Seat-door. But, so soon as he spied Mr. *Fife* in the Pulpit, he walked out again without saying a Word ; nor did any of us speak to him ; and not a single Person followed him.

Now, it is very remarkable, that, though Mr. *Robertson* came into the Meeting-house with his Gown on as usual, those of our Congregation whom he had seduced, were actually at that very Time convened in his House, and followed him to Bishop *Raitt's* Meeting-house in the Afternoon.

From this Day, Mr. *Robertson* left us, or rather deserted us, and joined with Bp *Raitt*. There left us, and followed him to Bp *Raitt's* Congregation, some Gentlemen's Families, and others.

Immediately upon Mr. *Robertson*'s joining Bp *Raitt*, severals who formerly attended that House, left it, and joined our Congregation.

Mr. *Robertson*'s leaving us, was certainly an Ease to our Minds ; for indeed we could not well attend his Ministriations, but with a doubting Mind, as we were uncertain but he might make new *Innovations* every Day. In short, we cannot tell what Mr. *Robertson* would be at : For, when we first remonstrated against his *Innovations*, he frequently said, he would leave us, and return from whence he came ; but it has evidently appeared, he had no real Intention to do so. And, when he understood we taxed him with Tenets contrary to the Reformed Principles, he seemed much surprised at our entertaining such an Opinion of him, and told us, that, for these many Years past, he had been *fighting* with the *Papists* on the one hand, and with the *Presbyterians* on the other. And we declare, That, ever since he came amongst us, he has been *fighting* against the Church of *England* ! So, where he will land, we know not. In the mean Time, we own, he did us a Favour in leaving us ; and we reckon ourselves happy in, again, having one Pastor in whom we can confide.

But it soon appeared, that Bp *Raitt* and Mr. *Robertson* had no mind we should enjoy this Happiness peaceably. For,

The 10th *August*, Mr. *Fife* received a holograph Letter from Bp *Raitt*, as follows.

Reverend SIR,

I Have sent you this, to require you to come along with the Bearer to my House, to speak with me, and to give Account of your Conduct in this Place, in intruding yourself into this Congregation, without my Allowance, and in manifest Contempt of my Authority ; which if you refuse to do, I hereby discharge you from officiating

sociating any more as a Clergyman in this Place, as you will answer it to your Ecclesiastical Superiors, and under the Penalty of incurring the Censures of the Church. This is from,

Directed thus,

Reverend SIR,

To the Reverend
Mr. David Fife, Dundee.

Your humble Servant,

(Sign'd) JAMES RAITT.

Mr. Fife told us, that he by no means reckoned himself under any Obligation to obey Mr. Raitt, because he could not look upon him as his rightful Ecclesiastical Superior; and that for the following Reasons.

" I am [said Mr. Fife] ascertained, from the Practice of the primitive Church, and all true Reformed Churches, That neither Clergy nor Laity ought to submit to the Authority of heterodox and schismatical Bishops, but to shun them as the Pestilence that wasteth at Noon-day; such being cut off from the salutary Communion of Christ's mystical Body, his Church. That Mr. James Raitt is heterodox in his Principles, and schismatical in his Practices, I think is most evident. For tho', upon his commencing a Minister of the Gospel, he did officiate several Years by the Liturgy of the Church of England only; yet no sooner did the Usages begin to spread, but he appeared very zealous for them, chiming in with such as were zealous Propagators of these Tenets and Practices. And when the Right Reverend the College of Bishops had drawn up a Formula, in order to suppress the said woful Usages, and ordered all the Episcopal Ministers to subscribe the same; tho' the said Mr. Raitt was present at a Meeting in Forfar, with his Brethren, who, out of real Principle, as well as in obedience to the Commands of their rightful Ecclesiastical Superiors, most chearfully signed that Formula; yet he refused to do so. I myself was one of the Number at that Meeting, and witnessed his thus obstinately refusing to obey the Commands of those whom he could not but own as his rightful Ecclesiastical Superiors. I know he has, ever since, continued a zealous Abetter of the Usages, and seems, every Day, more sanguine for them.

" Again, you, Gentlemen, are not ignorant how Mr. Raitt treated your Congregation about seventeen Years ago; how he, after a very strange and schismatical Manner, divided your Congregation, and set up a separate Meeting-house, and kept it up, not only in opposition to the Rightful Bishop, whose Congregation

" tion

"**tion he divided, but also against the express Order of the College of Bishops.**

" Now, if the being a keen Advocate for, and a zealous Promoter of these *Usages*, for which there is no Foundation in Scripture, be *Heterodoxy*; and if (out of Zeal for the Introduction of them into the publick Worship) openly to break the Peace of the Church, innovate, alter and maim our established Form of publick Worship, oppose and contemn the Commands of rightful Ecclesiastical Superiors, be *Schism*, then is Mr. Raitt guilty of both.

" The Year 1712, I was (according to the Form of the Church of England) ordained a Presbyter, by that most worthy and truly orthodox Prelate, *Alexander Ross* late Bishop of Edinburgh. I then (as that Form directs) declared my being fully persuaded, that the holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all Doctrine required of Necessity for eternal Salvation through Faith in Jesus Christ. I solemnly promised and engaged to instruct the People committed to my Charge out of the said Scriptures, and to teach or maintain nothing as required of Necessity to eternal Salvation, but that which I am persuaded may be concluded or proved by the Scriptures. How the *Usage Bishops* and Clergy (who have been ordained and consecrated according to the said Form) can acquit themselves of a very heavy Charge in this respect, I cannot see.

" If there is no Foundation in holy Scripture for *mixing the Eucharistick Cup with Water*; if there is no Foundation in Scripture for *Prayers for the Dead*, in the Sense of our Adversaries, but many plain Texts to the contrary; if offering the holy Eucharist as a true real propitiatory and expiatory Sacrifice, and that for the Dead as well as the Living, be altogether contrary to Scripture; if the Use of *Chrism*, or anointing with Oil, in *Baptism* and *Confirmation*, be not to be found in Scripture; if to own the Saints as *Mediators of Intercession* for us in Heaven, as well as Jesus Christ, be altogether contrary to Scripture, which teacheth, that there is but one God, and one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus; if there is no Foundation in Scripture for a *Middle State*, or, according to their Sense, a *Place distinct from Heaven and Hell*, in which the Souls of the Deceas'd are reserved till the Day of Judgment, and that there the Condition of those who have died in the Sign of Faith is such as can be bettered by the *Prayers of the Living*: I say, if there is no Foundation in holy Scripture for these *Usages*, and yet, notwithstanding, they (the *Usage-Divines*) teach and maintain them, to the great Disturbance of the Peace of the Church, how can they vindicate themselves from gross *Heterodoxy*, and a most flagrant *Schism*? This is indeed a heavy Charge: But, alas! it is

" too

“ too true, as I could easily make appear from their own Writings ; and I am heartily grieved at having Reason for such a Charge against those who denominate themselves Protestant Reformed Divines.

“ The Liturgy of the Church of *England* was introduced, and publickly and almost universally received and practised amongst those of the Episcopal Persuasion, during the Time Bp *Ross*, most deservedly, presided amongst the Bishops ; and that worthy Prelate opposed the *Usages* till the Day of his Death, which happened *March 1720*. I always did, and still do, look upon the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, as our established Standard of publick Worship, and sincerely declare, that it is, in my Opinion, the best Form of publick Devotion in the Christian World.

“ You, Gentlemen, may remember, that, when you first desired me to accept a Call from your Congregation, I would by no means agree to your asking Mr. *Raitt's* Concurrence in my Settlement, as I could not reckon him a regular orthodox Bishop, or my rightful Ecclesiastical Superior ; and you know it was with much Reluctance I agreed you might do it, as, you said, it was for the Sake of Peace, and that there was nothing in it but Compliment. As I was then against owning his Authority as a regular orthodox Bishop, or as my rightful Ecclesiastical Superior ; I am no less so now.

“ I know that, since the *Revolution*, many good orthodox Pastors did settle in Congregations at *Edinburgh*, and in other Places, even in Bishop *Ross's* Time, without asking his or any other Bishop's Concurrence, and yet enjoyed their Charges peaceably. Those worthy Prelates considered, that, as the Church was under a Cloud, they could not pretend to a regular *Jurisdiction* ; therefore, when a regular Body of People called a regular orthodox Clergyman for their Pastor, they did not pretend to assume the Power of a Negative in the Settlement, because their Concurrence was not asked and granted ; no, nor to give them the least Disturbance. They considered, that the principal Thing they were to take care of, was the keeping up of their own sacred Order, so as there might be regular Ordinations and Confirmations ; and that there might be regular Presbyters in the different Parts of the Kingdom, so as all of the Episcopal Persuasion might enjoy the Benefit of their Ministries.

“ Why Mr. *Raitt* should oppose my Settlement, seeing I have so ample and regular a Call, and so great a Concurrence in it, I know not, unless it be upon the Score of my opposing the *Usages*, and closely adhering to the Worship of the Church of *England*.

“ For

" For my part, I humbly think my Case is such, that, were the Episcopal Church in a flourishing Condition, and though he were a regular Diocesan Bishop, he would have been obliged, according to our Constitution, to have concurred in the Settlement."

As Mr. Fife would make no Return to the above Letter, either by Word or Writing, he gave it to our Managers, and said, if we pleased, we might give an Answer to it.

The 12th August, the Managers called a general Meeting of the Heads of Families, on purpose to consider the Letter.

1st, We took notice of the Word *intruding*. We have already mentioned, that we gave a regular Call to Mr. Fife to be our Minister in place of Mr. Irwine; and that all the Managers, and above five sixths of the Congregation, did cordially agree and concur in the Call. Now, we appeal to our impartial Reader, if accepting such a Call, from undoubted Patrons, can be called an *Intrusion*?

2dly, We took notice of the Expression, *intruding yourself into this Congregation*. Here we think Bp Raith begs the Question, taking it for granted that there is a real *Union* betwixt the two Congregations, and thereby making but one Congregation. It is true, (as already mentioned), there was but one Episcopal Congregation in this Place, from the *Revolution* till the Year 1727, when Mr. Raith, after a very strange Manner, divided it. The particular Facts and Circumstances of that Affair, together with Mr. Raith's Behaviour, are clearly represented by the Reverend and Learned Mr. James Dundas, in the Appendix to his *Impartial Inquiry into the Rise and Progress of the ancient Usage of Prayers for the Dead*, lately published. We again appeal to our Reader, after considering what has been said concerning the projected *Union*, whether there can be concluded any real *Union* betwixt the two Congregations? It is certain, that the only Thing they can have the least Pretence for building upon, is the Minute of Sederunt made by the Committees of the two Meeting houses the 11th April 1743. It is also certain, that the Power given to our Committee was, *To hear the Proposals of the other House, and to make a Report to a general Meeting*: But, in place of that, they heard and determined. At that general Meeting, the 24th June, when we, almost unanimously, reversed and rescinded that Agreement, the Majority of that our Committee were present, owned they had acted wrong by exceeding their Powers, were sorry for it, and were ready to suffer a Reprimand from the Meeting. Now, can such an Agreement, of a private Committee acting beyond their Powers, be any ways binding upon the Congregation? If not, how can they, with so much Assurance, assert an *Union*? For our Part, we are quite conscious to ourselves, that there is no *Union*; and that we never intended any, but upon Condition, *That the Liturgy of the Church of England should, without Innovations,*

be practised amongst us. Which Condition Bp *Raitt* flatly refused; nay, he reckoned us most assuming for pretending to propose any Conditions.

In the third place, We took notice of the Strain of the Letter in general. Were the Church entirely independent of the supreme civil Power, which all the *Usage-Clergy* most strenuously contend for, and, at the same time, were Bp *Raitt* vested with all the Powers and Privileges that ever any regular Diocesan Bishop enjoyed, and had Mr. *Fife* acted a most irregular and unwarrantable Part, the Letter could not have been in a more authoritative, nay arbitrary and peremptory Stile.

We will not dispute Mr. *Raitt's* Consecration; but, to own him, as an orthodox Bishop, or as our regular Diocesan Bishop, we cannot. Our Reasons will, we believe, be pretty evident to our Reader, after having considered this our Narrative.

When our late good Pastor, Mr. *Irvine*, was desired to meet with the other Clergy in the District, in order to elect one for a Successor to his deceas'd Colleague Bp *Ouchterlonie*, he would not give his Suffrage for Mr. *Raitt*, but voted for another; who, he thought, was, in more respects than one, better qualified for that high Office. We know very well what Mr. *Irvine's* Opinion, as to that Affair, was at that Time; if he, afterwards, changed his Opinion, as some of Bp *Raitt's* Party say he did, it is more than we know; but we have very good Reason to believe, that the Troubles which ensued upon the Death of his Right Reverend Colleague, contributed not a little to augment the Disease of which he died.

After thus reasoning among themselves, it was agreed by the Meeting, that an Answer ought to be given to the above Letter. Accordingly it was immediately wrote, signed by the Preses, and sent directly to Bp *Raitt's* House. It is as follows.

Right Reverend SIR,

WE the Members of the Episcopal Congregation in the Seagate Meeting-house, having met together to consider of a Letter wrote by you to our Minister Mr. *David Fife*, impeaching him for intruding into this Congregation, thereby supposing that there is an Union betwixt the two Congregations, which is not Matter of Fact, and, upon this pretended *Intrusion*, as you are pleased to call it, discharging him, in a magisterial Manner, to officiate any more as a Clergyman in this Place, and threatening him with the highest Censures of the Church, if he shall continue so to do.

Wherefore, upon mature Deliberation, and canvassing that Affair among ourselves, do find, that, supposing you were vested with all the Power and Authority that any regular Diocesan Bishop ever enjoyed, the Crime libelled, not being Matter of Fact, consequently

cannot infer the least Ecclesiastical Censure: But, notwithstanding of all this, if you, or any other pretending to an Authority over us not legally founded, should, out of Prejudice to our Pastor for his strenuously opposing the Usages, and closely adhering to the Liturgy of the Church of England, proceed against him by denouncing any of your Censures, which will not be binding in the Court of Heaven, being done *clave errante*; we, to show the World the Justice of our Cause, and Love we bear to our Minister, do, in a most solemn Manner, protest against all such Censures, as void and null of themselves, and do appeal to the first full Convocation of Bishops and Clergy legally assembled: And order this our Protestation to be inserted in our Books *ad futuram rei memoriam*. In Testimony whereof, we have caused our Preses to this Meeting, sign this Letter, in our Presence, this 12th Day of August 1743 Years.

Directed thus, To the Right Reverend Mr. James Raitt, Dundee.

We know Bp Raitt took this Answer greatly amis. If it is not wrote in that dutiful and respectful Manner, due from Laity to their good and *rightful* Bishop, it is because we cannot own him as such. We certainly have the utmost Regard and Respect for the *Episcopate*. We were blessed with two succeeding Pastors of that high Order; both which we could not but own as our *rightful* Bishops; and we heartily wished and wanted, (and often told Bp Raitt so himself), that Bp Raitt had been such to whom we might have given the same dutiful Respect and Regard.

We acknowledge our having applied to Mr. Raitt, oftener than once, as a Bishop: For, though we well knew and remembered how he divided our Congregation in the Year 1727; though we well knew that he still persisted in these *divisive* Principles and Practices, which induced him to make that (to say no worse of it) *irregular Step*; and though we had undeniable Objections against owning him for our *rightful* and regular Diocesan Bishop: yet, as he claimed such a Dignity and Power, and as we were most desirous to live peaceably with all Mankind, and at the same time not imagining he would make the least Objection to our enjoying publick Worship according to the Liturgy of the Church of England, we, for the sake of Peace, applied to him for his Concurrence in Mr. Robertson's Settlement, as one of our Ministers, and as Successor to our worthy deceas'd Pastor Bp Ouchterlonie. Which Concurrence he readily granted.

Again, when the said Mr. Robertson had, by his strange *Innovations* in the publick Worship, acted a Part inconsistent with the Reformation principles; and when, by his most *disingenuous* Behaviour, he had acted a Part inconsistent with the Rules and Principles of real Integrity, we applied a second Time to Bp Raitt for Redress

of these Grievances. But he was so far from granting it, that he endeavoured to vindicate Mr. Robertson in all his *Innovations*! Nay, in his own House, he heard Mr. Robertson declare, *That he would not repeat the Words militant here in Earth, as directed by the Rubrick, nor take the Sacrament to himself with the commemorative Clause, though the Bishop should desire him*; and even declare, *That he would comply with neither English nor Scots Liturgy*! We say, Bp Raitt heard Mr. Robertson make such Declarations, without giving him the least Rebuke! Now, when we are Witnesses of such Things, what can we think of such a Father and such a Son? Can we reckon them Friends to our Religion? Nay rather, have we not great Reason to believe they have conspired together to crush it? And, when we were thus situated, had we not the greatest Reason to look out for an orthodox Pastor of the same Communion with ourselves? Accordingly we found one in the Person of Mr. Fife, to whom we gave an ample and regular Call; and, notwithstanding the repeated harsh Treatment we had met with from Bp Raitt, yet still, to show how much we inclined to live peaceably with him and all the World, we again applied to him for his Concurrence in Mr. Fife's Settlement, as one of our Ministers, and as Successor to Mr. Irvine: Which Concurrence he absolutely refused, as we have already narrated. Thus (though we could not own Mr. Raitt for an orthodox Bishop, or as our rightful Bishop) did we apply to him three Times, and all for the Sake of Peace. But, in place of finding a kind, indulgent and condescending Father, we have met with quite the contrary, as will appear more fully in the Sequel.

Here we beg leave to make some Remarks upon the Behaviour of Bp Raitt and Mr. Robertson. And, first, As they are pleased to make such an Outery against us, for not joining in *Union* and *Communion* with Bp Raitt, we cannot help mentioning Mr. Raitt and his Congregation's Behaviour, in that respect, to our late Pastor Bp Ouchterlonie, *viz.* That, soon after the last *Concordate*, Bp Ouchterlonie proposed to unite the two Congregations; but, finding that his Proposal of an *Union* was altogether disagreeable to Mr. Raitt and his Congregation, he desisted from it. He used no artful Practices, nor any kind of Force, in order to bring it about: No, but dropt it altogether. Again, when Bp Ouchterlonie did, for upwards of three Years before his Death, administer the holy Sacrament of our Lord's Supper publickly in the Meeting-house once every Month, we affirm, that neither Mr. Raitt, nor one of his present Congregation, except those who lately separated from ours, ever communicated with the Bishop during all that Time; not even Mr. Robert White, who still continues one of Mr. Raitt's Congregation, and whom Bp Ouchterlonie ordained a Deacon; we say, not even he communicated with his Bishop during all that Time: Nay, we believe

lieve that Mr. *Raith* never did, at any Time, communicate with Bp *Ouchterlonie*.

Secondly, When we (in our Conversations with Bp *Raith* and Mr. *Robertson*) always declared ourselves to be of the Communion of the Church of *England*, and pleaded the Privilege of enjoying the Benefit of that Communion and Worship, as hitherto we had done, as we from a thorough Conviction believed it the best, and always looked upon it as the established Standard of publick Worship of our own National Episcopal Church, they both told us, that they were not of the Church of *England*, and that they had nothing to do with that Church.

Now, if Mr. *Robertson* had nothing to do with the Church of *England*, why accept of a Call from us? and why settle amongst us with a real View of altering our established Form of Worship, and thereby rendering himself the Instrument of tearing our Congregation to pieces, and of dividing Neighbours and nearest Friends and Relations in the same Families? And, when we expostulated with him about his dividing and tearing to pieces a Congregation at perfect Peace and Unity among themselves, and the fatal Consequences of such Division, he gave us this Answer: *Jesus Christ himself told, that he came not to send peace, but a sword, &c. Matth. x. 34. 35.* We say, Mr. *Robertson* gave such a Return to these our Expostulations!

It is but too evident, that Mr. *Robertson* came amongst us with a Design of altering our Worship: For, when he accepted of our Call, he could not plead Ignorance of our Persuasion. No: Bp *Ouchterlonie* and his Congregation were pretty publickly known; for he lived almost two Years and a half after his *Primus Bp Freebairn*, and during that Time stood in a manner single, (we mean as to his own Order). While he (Bp *Ouchterlonie*) lived, the *Usage-party* did not adventure to any publick Acts in order to propagate their Doctrines; but soon after his Death they began to shew themselves openly: Their Behaviour, since that Time, is well known, and the dire Effects of it sensibly felt. We say, Mr. *Robertson* could not plead Ignorance of our Persuasion; nay, he gave evident Proof that he knew for what End he was called, as he practised the Liturgy as directed by the Rubricks, for some time after his Settlement. But, after he had got some Footing, after he had made some Proselytes, and well knowing he was to be supported by Bp *Raith*; he by degrees threw off the Mask, and discovered himself to be, what we by sad Experience have found him, a most zealous Abetter of the *Usages*.

Again, If Bp *Raith* had nothing to do with the Church of *England*, why seek to make an *Union* with us? And, after we had again and again declared our Resolution of adhering to the Communion and Worship of that Church, why endeavour to force us into the *Union*?

with
Mr.
the Be-
done,
ways of our
were
with
Eng-
with
here-
on to
relati-
m a-
perfect
es of
told,
We
sions!
ith a
Call,
terlo-
the li-
and
own
l not
nes;
nly :
Ef-
nd I-
at he
s di-
But,
ytes,
y de-
e by
e U-
Eng-
gain
nion
e U-
ion?
nion ? And why distress and persecute us, because we would not be forced into an *Union* where we would have been obliged to give up this our Communion and Worship ?

Had our Opposition to Mr. *Robertson's Innovations, &c. &c.* proceeded from a giddy, restless, turbulent Spirit ; from a Dissatisfaction and Discontent at our established Form of Worship, and the Constitution of our Church ; from a restless Itch and Inclination for Novelties ; and that nothing less would serve us, than a Reform of the Constitution and Worship of our Church ; we say, had this been our Case, had this been our Temper and Disposition, Bp *Raith* and Mr. *Robertson* might have justly condemned us, and the World might have justly condemned us. But we appeal to all who know us, nay to our Adversaries themselves, if it is not quite otherwise with us ; and if ever we asked more, than to continue in the Communion of the Church according to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*.

But, because we would not give up this our Communion and Worship, and be entirely guided and directed according to the absolute Will and Command of Bp *Raith*, as our spiritual Sovereign, (the Way Mr. *Robertson* used to term him, when he said, *Bp Raith is your spiritual Sovereign, and, as such, ought to be obeyed ; the Bishop and I are your spiritual Guides, to whose Directions and Prescriptions you ought to give as ready Obedience and Compliance, as you would to the Directions and Prescriptions of your Physician, when on a Sick-bed*), we were therefore denominated a Parcel of *Schismatics*, a Name we detest and abhor. We believe the common Acceptation of the Word *Schism* is this, *A voluntary separating from the Unity of the Church of Christ*. Now, when we adhere to the Communion of the Church of *England*, can we be said to separate from the Unity of the Church of Christ ?

But they tell us, " That not being in Communion with the Bishop is the true Meaning of the Word *Schism* ; and therefore, [say they], " as you are not in *Union* and Communion with Bp *Raith*, you must be out of the Church, and consequently *Schismatics*."

We say, *frst*, That it is gross Dissimulation and Hypocrisy, in any Man, outwardly to join, where he does not inwardly agree. In the *next* place, Suppose Mr. *Raith* were really, according to the Constitution of the Church, and established Laws of the Kingdom, in every respect a regular Diocesan Bishop ; would that empower him to alter and maim the established Standard of publick Worship ? Would it intitle him to a Dominion over our Faith and Consciences ? Or would it intitle him to impose what Terms of Communion he pleased ? Certainly no. Then, if Mr. *Raith*, a very few Years after being ordained Presbyter, joined in Concert with a Set of Clergy, who, contrary to all Law and Order, endeavoured to introduce into the publick Worship, antiquated Usages, for which there

there is no Foundation in holy Scripture ; and thereby greatly disturbed the Peace of the Church, and the Peace and Quiet of Mankind : If, when the College of Bishops emitted a *Formula*, in order to suppress these *Usages*, and ordered all the Presbyters to sign it, he refused so to do ; and thereby slighted and contemned the Commands of his rightful Ecclesiastical Superiors : If he divided our Congregation in the Year 1727, and set up a separate Meeting-house, in opposition to our rightful Bishop ; and not only so, but kept it up in direct Contradiction to the friendly Advice and Commands of the College of Bishops ; and was thereby the Author of great Discord, Heats, Animosities, &c. amongst Neighbours, nearest Friends and Relations : If Bp *Raitt*, by his continuing to be a real Encourager and Promoter of these divisive Doctrines and Practices, and by supporting Mr. *Robertson* in his strange *Innovations*, has again made a Division in our Congregation, and thereby occasioned the greatest Disturbances and Disquiet, even among the nearest Friends and Relations in the same Families : If he makes a real Breach of our Standard of publick Worship the Terms of communicating with him ; and thereby stumbles and offends our Consciences : If, as we by sad Experience know, all the above is true ; and if such Doctrines and Practices visibly tend to crush and destroy the Religion and Worship of the Church of *England*, how can we, who have always professed ourselves to be of the Communion of that Church, own such a Man for an orthodox Divine, or a true Father of our Church ? or how can we, in Conscience, leave the Communion of the Church according to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, and join with him ? Wherefore, we hope the impartial World will not deem us *Schismatics* for not joining in Communion with Bp *Raitt* ; nor blame us for proposing such a *Condition*, as is above named, before entering into an *Union* with his Congregation ; nay, nor condemn us, for rejecting the *Union* altogether, after such *Condition* was absolutely refused.

And now we are come to the last Scene of Bp *Raitt*'s Proceedings against us. But, previous to that, we must acquaint our Reader, that, on the 20th *August* 1743, the following Bishops, *viz.* *Robert Keith*, *Robert White*, *William Falconer*, *James Raitt*, and *John Alexander*, were pleased to constitute themselves into a *Synod* ; and, after electing Bp *Keith* *Primus*, and Bp *Alexander* *Clerk*, they (from time to time, during the three Days Continuance of their *Synod*) enacted Canons, &c. with regard to the Worship and Government of the Church. So that here were five Men assuming to themselves the same Power and Prerogative that our National Synods formerly had during the Establishment of *Episcopacy* ! What Right or Title they had for so doing, we leave to our impartial Reader to determine, after

after perusing the *Act for the Establishment and Constitution of a national Synod*, made anno 1663.

Amongst the Transactions of this memorable Synod, is the following: viz. "Monday 22d August, After Prayers were said, and the Meeting constituted, a Complaint was offered to the *Synod* by Bp "Raitt, occasioned by an *Intrusion* upon his Episcopal Authority "acted in the Town of *Dundee*, by one *David Fife*, a Presbyter "in the District of *Dunkeld*. And, after some Discourse had passed thereupon, the Bishops agreed to concur, as far as needful, in pronouncing the Sentence of Deposition against him, upon the Libel being found proven, after Examination of Witnesses to that Effect. And did appoint three of their Number, viz. Bps *White*, *Falconer* and *Alexander*, to attend the Trial at any Place which Bp *Raitt* should judge most proper within his own District."

Here it is evident, that the Deposition of Mr. *Fife* is predetermined. Accordingly, in obedience to this *Synodical Decree*, the Sentence was, soon after, put in Execution. For,

The 26th of said Month of *August*, a Libel was delivered to Mr. *Fife*, intitled, *Libel the Right Reverend James Raitt Bishop of the District of Brechin, Carse of Gowrie, &c. against the Reverend Mr. David Fife Presbyter at Glamis and Glenboy.*

Which Libel contains the three following Articles, viz.

"1mo, Upon *Friday* the twenty second Day of *July* last, or upon one or other of the Days of that Month, you came to *Dundee*; and, in the Evening of that Day, or shortly after you came to Town; without the Consent or Knowledge of the Bishop, or Presbyter of the Episcopal Congregation there, did marry two Persons belonging to their Congregation, viz." (naming the two Persons).

"2do, Upon *Sunday* thereafter, the twenty fourth of the said Month of *July*, or upon one or other of the *Sundays* of that Month, you, impiously deserting your own Charge, did enter the *Seagate* Meeting-house before the usual Time for conveening to publick Worship, and did most wrongously and unjustly possess yourself of the Pulpit, to the Exclusion of the Reverend Mr. *William Robertson*, one of the established Pastors of the Congregation, who, coming in at the ordinary Time, in order to have performed the several Parts of divine Worship, and finding the Pulpit possessed by you, waited a while to see if you would quit your said wrongous Possession, and give him Access to his Pulpit; but in vain; for you continued fitting in it, and did there, contrary to the Bishop's express Prohibition, read Prayers and preach both in the Forenoon and Afternoon of that Day."

"3ro, That you have obstinately persisted to officiate in the said Meeting-house every Lord's Day since that Time, and still con-

"tinue

“ tinue to act and officiate as if you were regularly settled Presby-
 “ ter of that Place, in contempt of all Authority and Order, and
 “ in direct Opposition to the Bishop’s express and repeated Prohi-
 “ bition to the contrary, signified to you by a Letter written with
 “ his own Hand, and delivered to you by the Reverend Mess. Ro-
 “ bert Lyon at Perth, and Robert White in Dundee, in which he dis-
 “ charged you to exercise any Part of the Ministerial Function in
 “ Dundee, as you would answer it to your Ecclesiastical Superiors,
 “ and under the Penalty of incurring the Censures of the Church.
 “ All, or any of which three Articles of Libel being proven against
 “ you, you ought to be censured according to the Demerit of such
 “ Crimes *respectively*, for the Terror of others to do the like in Time
 “ coming, according to Justice. Signed at Dundee, the twenty sixth
 “ Day of August One thousand seven hundred and forty three Years.”

JAMES RAITT Bp.

Upon these three Articles of Libel, we remark in general,

1. That Bp *Raitt* all along begs the Question, (as formerly mentioned), taking it for granted that there is an *Union* betwixt the two Meeting-houses, consequently but one Congregation, and that he himself is one of the established Pastors of our Congregation. The contrary of which is, we hope, by this Time, most evident to our Reader.

2. That Bp *Raitt* makes himself both Judge and Party. Our Reader will observe, from our whole Procedure, that Mr. *Fife* is called to be one of our Ministers, in place of Mr. *Irvine* deceas’d, consequently as Colleague to Mr. *Robertson*. Now, if, in virtue of our Call, Mr. *Fife* did most wrongously and unjustly possess himself of the Pulpit, as is asserted in the above Libel, who was the Person that behoved to be injured by such wrongous and unjust Possession? Surely he who told us, *I am your Minister in place of Mr. Irvine; I am Mr. Robertson’s Colleague, and consequently there is no Vacancy in your Meeting-house.* But this very Person was Mr. *Fife*’s Accuser, was his Judge! and, on the first of September 1743, thought fit to pronounce no less a Censure than a Sentence of Deposition against him! Was not this making himself both Judge and Party with a Witness?

Now as to the Articles in particular. With regard to the *first*, We need make no further Remark, than to acquaint our Reader, that the two Persons Mr. *Fife* married, always were, and still continue Members of our Congregation; and were thrice legally proclaimed.

In the *second Article*, it is said, 1. *You, impiously deserting your own Charge, &c.* This is indeed a very heavy, but, at the same time, a very wrongful Imputation, as we ourselves can testify. When

we

we first spoke to Mr. *Fife* about giving him a Call, his greatest Objection was, the officiating with such a Colleague as Mr. *Robertson*. But, by several Arguments we used, particularly, That he well knew how the *Usage-party* had spread their Doctrines and Principles all be-north this; that, as our Congregation was remarkable for opposing the *Usages*, and the principal Obstacle to their forwarding their Designs in this Part of the Country, they were now leveling all their Force against us; that, since Mr. *Irvine's* Death, Bp *Raitt* and Mr. *Robertson* were endeavouring all they could to seduce us, and to force their Doctrines upon us; and that, as we were resolved to make a publick Stand in Defence of our Religion and Worship, we hoped he would agree to settle amongst us, and thereby prevent the bad Effects of Mr. *Robertson's* Innovations, and enable us effectually to make such a Stand: he at last agreed to settle even with such a Colleague, providing he got the Consent of his own Congregation. To procure which, we spoke to most of the considerable Members, and prevailed with them to comply with our Request. We appeal to these Persons, of Honour and Credit, themselves, for what we say. And besides, Mr. *Fife* himself spoke to almost the whole of those who retained to his Congregation at *Glenboy*, where he resided, both Gentlemen's Families, and others. It is true indeed, that Mr. *Fife* (after accepting our Call) was to have officiated at *Glamis* on *Sunday the 17th July 1743*; at the same time he had agreed to settle and officiate in our Meeting-house the 24th. But he, happening to fall distressed the 16th, was not able to go to *Glamis* next Day; wherefore wanted to go there the *Sunday after*; and accordingly wrote a Letter to our Managers, intreating we would dispense with his Settlement till the 31st. But, as all our Congregation had been already advertised of his settling the 24th; and as all of us were most anxious to have, at least, one Pastor in whom we could confide; nay, as many of us, on account of Mr. *Robertson's* strange Practices, and most-disingenuous Behaviour, could not, but with a doubting Mind, attend his Ministrations; and for that Reason had absented for some considerable Time; some for upwards of three, and a great many for upwards of two Months: it was therefore thought necessary to write Mr. *Fife*, that his Absence the 24th could not be dispensed with. It is possible, that the Misfortune of Mr. *Fife's* not being able to go to *Glamis* the 17th, and our not complying with his going thither the 24th, may have given Umbrage to some there; (it is probable his Discourse would have been suitable to the Occasion, and might have satisfied them): But, however that may be, we are sure he had the Consent of all the most considerable Members of that Country-charge (and it must be allowed a Thing almost impossible, to satisfy every Individual in such Cases) for his settling amongst us. For a further Proof of

this, Mr. Fife was lately amongst them performing sacred Offices, and that by Invitation: Nay, severals of that his late Charge, are almost every *Sunday* in our Meeting-house. These Things would not have happened, had Mr. Fife impiously deserted them.

2. It is there said, *You did enter the Seagate Meeting-house before the usual Time, &c.* We acknowledge, that, on the 24th *July*, we attended Mr. Fife to the Meeting-house, a few Minutes before the Hour; but indeed so very few, that severals were there before us. This Mr. Fife and we might lawfully do without Prejudice to any Person; and publick Worship was not begun till some time after Mr. Robertson had made a Shew of coming to officiate as usual, and immediately thereafter deserting us, as mentioned p. 27. 28.

3. *Ibid.* it is said, that Mr. Fife did most wrongously and unjustly possess himself of the Pulpit. This is indeed a very heavy Charge; but, as we said before, a very wrongfull one.

It is undeniable, that we are undoubted Patrons of our Meeting-house: As such we gave a regular Call to Mr. Fife to be one of our Ministers, in place of Mr. *Irvine* deceas'd: That Mr. Fife regularly accepted of this Call: That Bp *Raitt*'s Concurrence was asked, but absolutely refused; though it is certain, that, had the Episcopal Church been in a flourishing Condition, we, by the Aid of Law, could have obliged him (though he had been a regular Diocesan Bishop) to have concurred in the Settlement: That, in virtue of this ample and regular Call, Mr. Fife settled in our Meeting-house, and entered the Pulpit with the unanimous Consent of all the seven Managers, and with the chearful Concurrence of at least six to one of the Congregation.

Now, these Things considered, as Mr. Fife, in virtue of such a Call and Concurrence, settled in our Meeting-house; as he had the Consent of his late Charge for so doing; and as his entering the Pulpit was out of no Prejudice to Mr. Robertson's Right as Colleague, where was then the Wrong? where was the Injustice?

4. But, *ibid.* it is said, That Mr. Fife possessed himself of the Pulpit, to the Exclusion of Mr. Robertson. The contrary of this is most evident from our Behaviour all along to Mr. Robertson; as may be clearly seen in the Narrative, particularly in our Call to Mr. Fife, p. 24. and in the three following Pages. We say, let our impartial Reader consider these Passages, and we are perswaded he will clearly see we never intended to exclude Mr. Robertson. If we had had any such Intention, why did the Managers (upon Mr. Fife's coming to Town) acquaint Mr. Robertson, that Mr. Fife was to officiate in our Meeting-house the Sunday following, as one of our settled Ministers, and as his Colleague, as mentioned p. 26.?

Again, why did Mr. Fife agree to settle amongst us, with the Disadvantage of such a Colleague? and why did he accept of our Call,

Call, wherein it is most evident that he is called to be one of our Ministers ; not in place of Mr. Robertson, but to fill up the Vacancy occasioned by the Death of Mr. Irvine ; and consequently to be Mr. Robertson's Colleague ? And, again, why did we, in our Call, bind for no more than L. 40 Stipend to Mr. Fife, but because we had a Stipend to pay to our then Pastor Mr. Robertson ? For, since he deserted us, and that Mr. Fife has undertaken the Charge singly, we have augmented his Stipend considerably.

Had we intended to exclude Mr. Robertson the Pulpit, we might have done it before Mr. Fife's Settlement, and that in a very short Way, *wiz.* by shutting the Meeting-house Door. But indeed we never had any such Intention : Though, had we done so by a Man who had so notoriously broke Faith with us, and who had in a manner declared himself not to be of the same Communion with us, we are apt to think the impartial Part of Mankind would have excused us.

It is true, Mr. Fife was in the Pulpit when his Colleague made his Appearance ; but, as he had an equal Right, he might lawfully be there without any Intention to exclude Mr. Robertson. And our then immediate Behaviour plainly shows there was no such Intention : For, though Mr. Robertson, two Days before, had told us, *he could not be our Minister* ; and though Bp Raitt, the Day before, told, that Mr. Robertson *could not practise any Form of divine Service amongst us* : yet the Gentleman (a present Manager) who attended, did, upon seeing him coming up Stairs, open his Seat-door. But he, spying Mr. Fife in the Pulpit, went out immediately without saying a Word : so that we are morally certain he was not one Minute, nay, we believe, not half a Minute in the Meeting-house. Whether Mr. Robertson came in with Intention to perform the several Parts of divine Worship, as is said in the above Article, we must leave to our Reader to judge, when we assure him, that, when he thus made a Shew of presenting himself, those of our Congregation whom he had seduced, were actually at that very Time conveened in his Dwelling-house ?

From all which it is evident, that neither Mr. Fife nor we had any Design to exclude Mr. Robertson.

It is indeed very true, that we endeavoured, all in our Power, to get his strange Innovations excluded the publick Worship ; but Bp Raitt took care we should not succeed in that : And therefore it is also true, that Mr. Robertson's leaving us, was a great Relief to our Minds. But to assert, that Mr. Fife's Settlement was with Intention to exclude him, is really doing Mr. Fife and us great Injustice.

As to the *third Article*, wherein it is said, " That you [Mr. Fife] " have obstinately persisted to officiate in the said Meeting-house " every Lord's Day since that Time ; and still continue to act and

" officiate as if you were regularly settled Presbyter of that Place." With regard to which,

1. We humbly think, that Mr. *Fife*, by continuing to officiate every Lord's Day since that Time, has acted the Part of a faithful true Pastor.

2. We humbly think, that Mr. *Fife* is as regularly settled in our Meeting-house, as the present Circumstances of our Church can well allow of. For, 1. Mr. *Fife*, as before mentioned, had the Consent of his Country-congregation, for settling amongst us. 2. There was no Ecclesiastical Superior in the District where Mr. *Fife* resided, to whom we might apply for his Consent; and when we presented the Call to Bp *Raitt*, he did not, as we expected, desire us to procure the Consent of any other Bishop or Bishops for Mr. *Fife*'s Removal. 3. We did what was incumbent upon us, and are persuaded, that, in our Proceedings, we had the Sense of Law on our Side. And, 4. Because Bp *Raitt* claimed the Right of Collation, we (for Peace sake) asked and intreated his Concurrence. But, because Bp *Raitt* absolutely refused what, in Law and Justice, every regular Diocesan Bishop ought, in such a Case, to give, we reckoned that no sufficient Reason for us to reject Mr. *Fife*: For, as we are undoubted Patrons, we certainly have a Right of chusing our own Ministers, of giving a Call or Presentation to whom we please; and, as Bp *Raitt* made no Objection to Mr. *Fife*'s Life or Conversation, to his Doctrine or Sufficiency, we beg leave to say, that his refusing his Concurrence in the Settlement, was contrary to both Law and Justice. And therefore, as we had evidently the Sense of Law on our Side, we, in virtue of our just Right, received Mr. *Fife* as one of our established Pastors, and adhere to him as such.

Lastly, We remark, that, in the above Articles of Libel, it is said, That what Mr. *Fife* did in this Matter, was *without the Consent or Knowledge of Bp Raitt*, and *contrary to his express Prohibition, &c.* And in Bp *Raitt*'s Letter, referred to in the third Article, it is said, *without my Allowance, and in manifest Contempt of my Authority.*

The denying Bp *Raitt*'s Authority, and not yielding a ready Obedience to his absolute Will and Commands, seems to be Mr. *Fife*'s greatest Crime; and, in their Opinion, such as deserved the highest Censure. This is verified by the above Citation from the Minutes of their *Synod*.

Mr. *Fife*'s Reasons for not owning Bp *Raitt*'s Authority, and consequently for not obeying his Commands, are narrated in p. 29. 20. 31. 32. to which we refer our Reader; who, we believe, will there find a sufficient Vindication of Mr. *Fife*.

Indeed the present Bishops arrogate to themselves a very absolute and independent Power; and, in the Exercise of this Power and Authority, act in contradiction to the established Laws, Civil as well

as Ecclesiastical! They have, of late, lorded it over the Brethren, in the strictest Sense of the Expression; witness the publick Remonstrances of the Presbyters of the Diocese of Edinburgb.

And now, from what is said, we hope it evidently appears, that the second and third Articles (and upon which the Sentence proceeds) of Bp Raitt's Libel against Mr. Fife, are really a most wrongfull Charge; consequently, any Sentence of Censure passing thereupon, must be altogether unjust.

We know the Bishops and Clergy say, That their Courts, such as Councils, Synods, &c. are influenced and directed by the Spirit of God; that the Holy Ghost presides amongst them; and that all their Decisions, Sentences, &c. are ratified in the Court of Heaven, in order to make them binding upon Earth.

We do not deny, that the lawful Governors of the Church, lawfully met together, for right Purposes, may expect some Measure of divine Direction: But, if in their Synods, Councils, &c. they either ask Things not fit to be asked, or attempt to innovate upon the sacred Scriptures, *viz.* to introduce into the Worship of the Church, Doctrines contrary to, or not founded on the Scriptures; or if they should make unlawful Decisions, should pronounce unjust Sentences of any kind: we think, that, in such Cases, they can expect no divine Direction or Assistance. The Holy Ghost can never be presumed to preside or assist, where the Proceedings are sinful; nor can an unjust Sentence be ratified in the Court of Heaven, where the God of Truth and Justice reigns.

It is certain, that Bishops and Clergy are fallible as well as other Men. Every one knows, that the Order itself does not make the Clergy wiser or better than other Men, and that the Priest is as much under the Dominion of the Senses as the Layman, and as much subjected to the Violence of all the Passions; so that he always appears to be as frail as other Men. The Clergy, therefore, as well as the Laicks, may be swayed by Temper, may be corrupted by Ambition or Avarice, and may be led by Passion, Prejudice, &c.

We are firmly persuaded, that the Persecution against Mr. Fife proceeded from real Prejudice and Partiality, and we believe every unprejudiced Person will think so, after considering this our Narrative: Particularly that Passage, *viz.* That Bp Raitt made no Objection to Mr. Fife's Life and Conversation, to his Doctrine or Sufficiency; or to the Regularity of his Call. Why then did he not concur in the Settlement? For no other Reason, that we can conceive, but because he knew Mr. Fife was a stanch Opposer of the Usages, and a firm Adherer to the Communion and Worship of the Church of England: Consequently, that, by his Settlement amongst us, we would be the better enabled to make a publick Stand in defence of our Religion and Worship, and thereby frustrate their Design of proselyting

felyting us. And it is most evident, from the above Passage in the Minutes of their late *Synod*, that Mr. *Fife's* Deposition was there decreed; and accordingly Bp *Raitt* with his Brethren, met here, and put that their Decree in Execution.

From all which we hope it evidently appears, that the second and third Articles of the above Libel are most wrongful Accusations; and that the Persecution against Mr. *Fife* proceeded from Prejudice and Partiality. As, therefore, any Sentence of Censure proceeding upon such Grounds, must, in itself, be altogether unjust, it cannot possibly be ratified in the Court of Heaven, and consequently can never be binding upon Earth.

We therefore believe Mr. *Fife's* Character, as a Presbyter, quite entire; we consider him as persecuted for his orthodox Principles; we look upon him as our rightful Pastor, and adhere to him as such. By thus adhering to him, we do no more than what (we humbly think) of common Right belongs to us, *viz.* to vindicate Right and Innocence when oppressed, and to assert the Religion we profess, and for his firmly adhering to which, against all Innovations, he is persecuted.

We learn, from undoubted Authority, that, when St *Athanasius* was most unjustly oppressed and persecuted by the *Arians*, and publicly deposed by a *Synod* of *Arian* Bishops, for his orthodox Faith; yet, notwithstanding that Deposition, the orthodox Bishops and Clergy did look upon his sacred Character as quite entire, by owning him as a most worthy Bishop and Father of the Church. They communicated with him, and gave him all the Comfort and Assistance in their Power; and they reckoned it a necessary Duty in them, thus to avow St *Athanasius*, as suffering in the Cause of the common Faith. Thus the orthodox Bishops and Pastors of the Church treated not only St *Athanasius*, but also others in like Circumstances, *viz.* others who were illegally and unjustly persecuted and oppressed. And we have the Pleasure and Satisfaction to acquaint our Reader, that, notwithstanding the Deposition, the Presbyterian Character of our Reverend Pastor Mr. *Fife* is still looked upon as entire, and that by many Divines full as considerable for Learning, Knowledge, &c. and some of them, most deservedly, in as high Office in the Church, as any who assisted at the Deposition.

The CONCLUSION.

AS we have some Things to object against Mr. Robertson, and the *Usage-Clergy*, which did not naturally occur in the preceding Narrative, we shall here narrate them. And,

1. A Conversation which happened betwixt Mr. Robertson and a Gentlewoman, some time after his Settlement amongst us, *viz.* Immediately after he had come from witnessing the Interment of one of our Congregation, his Discourse, with this Gentlewoman, was concerning the State of departed Souls. He asked her this Question, *Where do you think the Souls of the Righteous go, immediately after their Departure from the Body?* To which she replied, "I believe they immediately go to Heaven." He told her, *it was not so; for that no impure Thing could enter there.* She answered, "That she did not think the Soul of a righteous Person *an impure Thing.* But, [said she], if they do not go directly to *Heaven*, to what other Place do they go? For the Scripture mentions but two Places for the Souls of the Deceas'd, *Heaven* and *Hell*; and, if you will not allow it to be one of these, you'll *just dress up old Purgatory to us again?*" He replied, *Wherever it be, they have a certain Place assigned them, but it is not Heaven.* The Gentlewoman rejoined, "That is a Doctrine of Bp Gaderer's, and of his Followers and Adherents; it is what I never *was taught; it is what I cannot learn from Scripture; and therefore cannot believe it.*"

Now, it is very remarkable, that though Mr. Robertson thus endeavoured, privately, to proselyte, yet (understanding he was taxed with *Popish* Tenets) he, publickly from the Pulpit, disclaimed this Doctrine of the *Middle State*, or rather *Middle Place*, and said, That the Scriptures mentioned only two Places for departed Souls, the one *called Heaven*, and the other *called Hell*.

Here we must again remark how agreeable this Behaviour of Mr. Robertson's is to the *Jesuitical Maxim* mentioned p. 13. If this Gentlewoman, or any other whom he intended to seduce, should, in the Event of his Speeches and Persuasions, prove his real Proselyte, good and well; we, perhaps, should have heard nothing of it: But if otherwise, and if, upon her exposing these his Principles and Practices, he, in order to gain the Populace, and to make the World believe quite otherwise of him, openly disclaims them from the Pulpit, what is his Behaviour in so doing? We shall leave it to our Reader to give it a Name.

It is agreed by all orthodox Divines, that the Scriptures mention only

only two Places for departed Souls, *Heaven and Hell*. It is the Opinion (founded on Scripture) of the Church of *England*, and of all Reformed Churches, that the Souls of the Righteous, immediately upon their Departure from the Body, go to Heaven: And, from reading the Writings of our most learned Divines, we find it irrefragably demonstrated, that this was the Opinion of the pure primitive Fathers, for at least the first four Centuries; and that a third Receptacle for departed Souls, *viz. Purgatory*, was not contrived till after the fourth Century. Abp *Usher*, and many other learned Divines affirm, That, the *Popish* Doctrine of Purgatory was not known in the Church of God, for the first six hundred Years, *viz.* till Pope *Gregory I.*

The Doctrine of the *Middle State* of the *Usage-men*, we learn from a Book in Folio, intitled, *The Doctrines of a Middle State between Death and the Resurrection; of Prayers for the Dead; and the Necessity of Purification, &c.* printed at *London anno 1721*, and published by an *Usage-Bishop* of our own Nation, who was one of the chief Instruments of propagating these woful *Usages*. The Definition, according to this Author, is as follows, *viz.* *An Intermediate, or Middle State, distinct from Heaven and Hell, for departed Souls to abide in, between Death and the Resurrection, called Hades.* The Author tells us, *That this Hades is divided into a Right-hand Side, and a Left-hand Side: That the Right-hand Side is for the Souls of those who die in the Sign of Faith, i. e. in the Communion of the Church; the Left-hand Side for the Souls of the Impenitent.* — *That the Right-hand Side is a State of painful Purification.* — *That the Souls there must go through such Purgations, as are necessary for their Purification; and that they have need of, and are very much helped and assisted by the Prayers and Offerings of the living Faithful.*

Now, we believe, that, upon Comparison, there will be found a pretty near Affinity betwixt this Doctrine and that of *Purgatory*.

It is the Opinion of learned Divines, *That Plato's Notion of a middle Sort of Men going down to Hell to be purged and absolved by grievous Torments, and the Fictions of Homer and Virgil, setting forth the Complaints of Souls departed, for their not being relieved by Prayers and Sacrifices, are perhaps the true Sources of the Doctrine of Purgatory, and of redeeming Souls out of it.* And therefore they call Purgatory *a Remnant of Paganism*.

2. Another Charge against Mr. *Robertson* is, That, (before our Differences with him came to any Height), being one Day visiting a Gentlewoman of our Congregation, he saw lying before her Dr. *Stanhope's* Translation of *Kempis* on the *Imitation of Jesus Christ*, which

which she, deservedly, made Part of her private Devotions. He was pleased to tell her, that there was a later Translation of this Piece of *Kempis*, that it was much nearer the Sense of the Author, and that it was far preferable to this (meaning Dr. *Stanhope's*) Translation. It is true, he did not name the Author of the later Translation, but recommended it to the Gentlewoman as much preferable to Dr. *Stanhope's*.

We have made it our Busines to learn, whether there be any later *Englysh* Translation; and, after Inquiry, are quite satisfied there is none, except Mr. *Keith's*, (now Bp *Keith*), which he published in the Year 1717, intitling it, *Select Pieces of the Reverend and pious Thomas à Kempis*, vol. 1. *In which are contained four Books of the Imitation of Jesus Christ*. In the Beginning of this Volume he gives an Account of the Author; to which he subjoins a Catalogue of the several Treatises wrote by him, being twenty seven in number. And, in the End of his Address to the Reader, he says, *There is a Design of publishing some other select Pieces of this Author, in the same Size and Letter*. Accordingly, some Time after, he published the second Volume, containing the *Valley of Lilies*, and *Soliloquy of the Soul*. And the two Volumes are sold together.

Mr. *Dundass*, in his *Impartial Enquiry*, p. 39. &c. has made several Remarks on the second Volume, and plainly proves, that Bp *Keith* maketh Addresses to the Saints Part of our Devotion, and that his Strain is such, as if the Saints were equal Mediators and Advocates with our Lord. Mr. *Dundass* concludes his Remarks thus: "Is this the *true Spirit of Christianity*? Is this the *Doctrine of the Spirit of God*, which teacheth us, that there is but one *God, and but one Mediator between God and Men, the Man Christ Jesus*? Is this according to the *Doctrine of the Church of England*, founded in the *Scriptures*, that *Jesus Christ is our only Mediator and Advocate*? Whither would this *Man* lead us? What does he mean, thus so sacrilegiously and blasphemously to rob *our blessed Saviour* of the *Glory of his Mediatorship*, and give *it to Saints and Angels*, as if they were his *Equals and Copartners!*"

As Mr. *Dundass* takes no Notice of the first Volume, and as Mr. *Robertson* was pleased to recommend it as preferable to Dr. *Stanhope's* Translation, we shall here make some Remarks on it.

In his Address to the Reader, he says, "The great Scope and *Design of this little Manual* (and in Truth of all this Person's *Writings*) is, to advance the Soul into a State of Union with *God in Christ* by the *Imitation of the Life of the holy Jesus*. — Of this the *holy Man* treats in so sublime and *divine* a Manner, as must convince his Readers, that he hath been assisted therein *with an Uncion from on high*." And *ibid.* "And indeed, who-
ever

" ever reads these Books with a single Heart, will undoubtedly feel
" in them just such an inward *Energy* or secret Virtue as is ge-
" nerally found in the inspired Writings *after a superlative Man-
" ner.*"

It is evident from these two Passages, that Bp *Keith* would make his Readers believe, that whatever the Author wrote (even his *Popish* Corruptions not excepted) were the Dictates of the Holy Spirit; and that, as to influencing the Heart with pious Affections, they are equal, if not preferable to the holy Scriptures themselves.

Again, *ibid.* " Moreover, that which highly recommends these Writings, is, that they are altogether free from jejune Speculations, metaphysical Subtilties, doubtful Arguments, or Things secret and unrevealed, which do commonly serve to tickle the Fancy, and no more."

We heartily wish, that this could be truly said, not only of these Writings, but also of the Writings and Discourses of many other Divines. In the mean time, as Bp *Keith* is pleased to say, that *these Writings are altogether free from Things unrevealed*, we beg leave to ask him this Question, Where is it revealed, that, in our Devotions, we ought to address the Saints? Not in the holy Scriptures, for such a Doctrine is altogether repugnant to the Word of God. But such a Doctrine is inculcated in *these Writings*, viz. *Book 3. chap. 58. p. 240.* In the Dialogue betwixt Christ and the Soul, our Lord is said to speak to the Soul thus: *It is better to address the Saints with devout Requests and Tears, and to crave their glorious Suffrages with a humble Mind, than to search into their Secrets with vain Curiosity.*

As we said before of the Doctrine of *Purgatory*, that it was called by learned Divines *a Remnant of Paganism*; so we think this Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*, may justly come under the same Denomination: For, as a learned Prelate observes, " It was a Part of Heathenish Idolatry, to invoke either Demons, or departed Men, whom they considered as good Beings subordinate to the divine Essence, and employed by God in the Government of the World; and they had almost the same Speculations about them, that have been since introduced into the Church, concerning Angels and Saints."

Now, if it is most evident from the sacred Records, that the Invocation of Saints or Angels is altogether repugnant to the Word of God; if we see it irrefragably demonstrated by the most learned and orthodox Divines, that such a Doctrine is condemned by the concurrent Testimonies of all the Catholick Fathers of the first three Centuries at least; and that, in the Council of *Laodicea*, anno 367, it is condemned as *Idolatry*: is it not most astonishing to find a Christian Bishop thus endeavouring to propagate such a Doctrine!

We

We have but one Remark more from his Address to the Reader, where he says, " As to the present Edition, Care hath been taken " to render it very close, according to the Original. Some late E- " ditions have been complained of, at least in this Country, for the " too great Liberty which was used (no doubt with a good Inten- " tion) in departing too far from the Author's Words, and by gi- " ving to several Passages a different Turn, by foreign *Additions* " or *Illustrations*. And therefore it was thought advisable, to send " forth this *Impression*, in the plain simple Stile of the *Author*, who " imitates the Stile of the holy Scriptures."

We are verily persuaded, that none *in this Country*, except those who prefer the Religion of *Kempis* to that of the Church of *Eng- land*, ever did, or will complain of Dr. *Stanhope's* Translation. As to his *Additions* or *Illustrations*, we are so far from believing them *foreign*, that we really think them great Embellishments, and most apposite. Let any intelligent Person read and compare the two E- ditions, and, we dare say, he will agree with us, that Dr. *Stanhope's* is, both as to Matter and Stile, far preferable, especially to the *Pro- testant Reader*, as being free from Superstition.

This excellent Translation of Dr. *Stanhope's*, intitled, *The Christian's Pattern*, is so universally esteemed, that it has already under- gone twelve Editions at least; and, after this, why Bp *Keith* should publish such an Edition, and, together with it, the second Volume, we can see no Reason, unless with a Design to propagate, piece- meal, the Religion of *Kempis* in this Country: And, from the dear- bought Experience we have had of Mr. *Robertson*, we have the greatest Reason to believe he had the same View in *recommending* that Bp *Keith* had in publishing it.

3. Another Charge is, That, when (in our Communings with them, concerning their Doctrines, &c.) we proposed plain Texts of Scripture for our Vindication, it was told us, *You are no Judge of the Scriptures, and you must take the Explanation of them as the Church gives it you.*

Now, to tell us we are no Judge of Scripture, is, in a manner, forbidding us to read the Scripture: For what we are not Judge of, we cannot understand; and what we cannot understand, it is quite needless for us to read. It is in a manner telling us, that we are not capable to judge for ourselves, and therefore we must believe as they bid us, and do as they direct us. Such a Doctrine must surely have a very strange Sound in the Ears of all, except those who, being deprived of Christian Liberty, are abject Slaves to pretended *Infallibility*. This is exacting *implicit Faith* from us: This is plainly depriving us of the Right of *private Judgment*, which all Man- kind enjoy by Birth! It is making us little better than mere Ma- chines:

chines: It is exalting themselves to the highest Pitch, and debasing the rest of Mankind to the lowest! In short, this is the fundamental Principle of *Jesuitism*, of *Popery*, and a plain Inlet to *Infallibility*; which Dr. Barrow calls, *the Mother of Incorrigibility*, and says, *the greatest Tyranny that ever was invented in the World, is the Pretence to Infallibility.*

The learned Mr. Chillingworth says, " Let those leave claiming " *Infallibility* that have no Title to it, and let them that in their Words " disclaim it, disclaim it likewise in their Actions. In a Word, " take away Tyranny, which is the Devil's Instrument to support " Errors, and *Superstitions*, and *Impieties*, in the several Parts of the " World, which could not otherwise long withstand the Power of " Truth; I say, take away Tyranny, and restore Christians to " their just and full Liberty of captivating their Understanding to " *Scripture only*: And as Rivers, when they have a free Passage, " run all to the Ocean; so it may well be hoped, by God's Blessing, " that universal Liberty, thus moderated, may quickly reduce " Christendom to Truth and Unity."

The noble *Bereans* (*Acts xvii. 11. 12.*) are commended for searching the *Scriptures*, that thereby they might see with their own Eyes, and know and judge with their own *private Judgment*, whether even the holy Apostle St. *Paul* told them Truth or not; whether those Things he taught, were what Jesus Christ taught his Apostles, or not. This was far from taking or receiving the Word implicitly from even an Apostle. And they are so far from being condemned for not surrendering or resigning their *private Judgment* even to an Apostle, that they are highly commended for their searching, and for their Examination, by their *private Judgments*, of what was delivered to them by St. *Paul*.

Our blessed Saviour himself says to the People, *Search the scriptures*; — for they are they which testify of me, *John v. 39*. Again, he saith to the People, *Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?* *Luke xii. 57*. From which it is most evident, that our Saviour did not debar the People from searching, and making use of their *private Judgment*, but the contrary.

Mr. *Leslie* (in his *Case stated, between the Churches of Rome and England*) says, " But the Prophet calls a due Examination of these " Things, a *shewing ourselves to be men*, *Is. xlvi. 8.* And St. *Luke* " gives it the Character of a Nobleness of Spirit in those who *searched* " the *scriptures* daily, whether those things were so, *Acts xvii. 11.* " *12.* and therefore [says he] many of them believed, of the Honourable both Men and Women. Whilst those bigotted who stuck to " implicit Faith in the Church, it is said, *Ver. 5.* they believed not, " but were moved with envy, and stirred up Persecution against " those who disturbed them in their Security, like waking one out

" of

“ of his Sleep ; though, when it is done, he will thank those who
“ have raised him from Darkness to Light, to seeing with his own
“ Eyes, instead of being led by others implicitly in the dark, and
“ lulled into Dreams of Security from his Blindness.” A little af-
terwards the Author says, “ But I think the Apostle recommends
“ examining to us ; and I will conclude with his Advice: *Prove all*
“ *things, and hold fast that which is good, 1 Thess. v. 21.*”

In professing ourselves to be Christians, we undertake to keep God’s holy Will and Commandments: Now, where shall we learn God’s Will and Commands, but in his Word, where he is pleased to manifest his Will to us for our Direction? Here then we must see and learn, what is the Duty, and what ought to be the Life of a Christian. In this holy Word almighty God speaks to us, and shews us his Will and our Duty. This holy Word he hath given us to instruct us, and teach us, what it is he requires of us, and to conduct and guide us in the good and perfect Way to eternal Felicity. Upon this Rock therefore we must build our eternal Happiness: From this sacred Fountain we must draw the *Words of eternal Life.*

Again, From God’s holy Word we learn, *That we must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ; that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad, 2 Cor. v. 10.* *That every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labour, 1 Cor. iii. 8.* *That every one of us shall give account of himself to God, Rom. xiv. 12.* And, *That every man shall bear his own burden, Gal. vi. 5.*

Now, though our spiritual Guides *watch for our souls*, and must, at the great Day, give account of themselves as Watchmen; must give account, whether, in their Teaching, Preaching, &c. they framed their Doctrine according to the right Rule, *the written Word of God*; and how far they thereby conducted aright, or misled those committed to their Charge: We say, though *they watch for our souls*, and must answer to God for their pastoral Care; yet this does not imply, that they alone are to answer for our Souls at the Day of Judgment: No; for it is most evident, from the above Texts of Scripture, that that is a Burden every Individual must personally bear. *At that Day no Man can excuse, or answer for another; but every one’s Burden will be enough, nay more than enough for himself.* Therefore, though we, by blindly following our spiritual Guides, should, together with them, *fall into the ditch*; yet that will never excuse us. Ought we not then to imitate the *Bereans*? Ought we not to look well about us in what concerns our eternal Welfare? Surely we cannot be too careful about an Affair of such Moment.

Though we reckon it our necessary Duty to imitate the *Bereans*; yet we by no means think it incumbent on us (though we were Masters of the greatest Learning) to make nice Disquisitions about difficult

scult and abstruse Points. No : We humbly think, that the Tongues and Pens of many wrangling Logicians, Philosophers, and Divines, might have been much better employed than about such Matters. Thanks be to almighty God, the holy Scriptures are sufficiently clear in all essential and necessary Points, so that every unprejudiced, serious and reasonable Inquirer will there find sufficient to make him wise unto salvation. For (as Bp Beveridge says) *the Scripture itself doth bear witness for itself, that itself is able to make a Man wise to Salvation, 2 Tim. iii. 15, ; which it could not do, unless it contained all Things necessary to Salvation.*

Again, From God's holy Word we learn, that, in our Saviour's Time, there were Guides, of the Ferment of whose Doctrine good People were bid beware, who transgressed and defeated the Commandment of God by their Tradition. These our Saviour calleth blind Guides, who both themselves did fall, and drew others into the Ditch of noxious Error. St. Paul, in his Epistle to the Colossians, and in that to Titus, complains, that there were such who turned from the Truth, by giving heed to the Commandments and Doctrines of Men. And indeed it is but too apparent from History, that Seducers and counterfeit Guides have appeared in all Ages.

Again, In the sacred Records we are commanded to avoid, or turn away from such as innovate upon the holy Scripture. If any man teach otherwise, and consent not to wholesome words, even the Words of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the doctrine which is according to godliness; he is proud, knowing nothing, but doting about questions and strifes of words, whereof cometh envy, strife, railings, evil surmisings, perverse disputings of men of corrupt minds, and destitute of the truth; — from such withdraw thyself, 1 Tim. vi. 3. 4. 5. Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned; and avoid them, Rom. xvi. 17. We are also commanded in Scripture, to beware of false prophets, which come to you in sheep's clothing, Matth. vii. 15. Let no man deceive you with vain words, Eph. v. 6. Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men, after the rudiments of the world, and not after Christ, Col. ii. 8. Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whether they are of God: because many false prophets are gone out into the world, 1 John iv. 1. Now, how shall we be able to obey these, and such like Precepts of the Gospel, but by imitating the Bereans?

From all which we reckon it our incumbent Duty, to imitate the noble Bereans; to regard the holy Scripture as the sole Rule of our Faith and Manners; to study it much, to read it often, carefully and diligently endeavour to find the true Sense of it, and to live according to it; diligently and carefully to examine those Things that are spoken by our Ministers or Teachers; to receive such Things as are consonant

consonant to the Scriptures, but to reject such Things as are contrary to them; and by all Means to turn away from those that persist in such Doctrines.

4. Another Charge is, That because we would not, in a manner, give up our *Christian Liberty*, and be governed, guided and directed according to their absolute Will and Pleasure, we were not only termed a Parcel of *Schismaticks*, but also compared to the Rebels in King *Charles I.*'s Time. For Proof of this we beg Leave to mention Part of a Conversation which happened betwixt a Lady and a certain Bishop, to whom the Lady put the following Question: " Do you believe it a Sin to repeat, in administering the holy Communion, the Words in the *commemorative Clause*?" He answered, " Madam, God forbid I should think it a Sin to repeat these Words; for they are agreeable to our Saviour's own Words." " Why then [said the Lady] did you not comply with that [meaning our] Congregation; for all they asked, in order to an *Union* of the two Houses, was, to continue in the Practice of the Liturgy of the Church of *England*?" To which he gave the following Return, " Madam, *The Rebels, in King Charles I.'s Time, the more Concessions the King made, the more they asked, and the more arrogant they grew.*"

With regard to King *Charles*, we sincerely believe he is now wearing a never-fading Crown of Glory in the Kingdom of Heaven. Our Adversaries will not deny, that he died a *Martyr* for the Church of *England*. Now, we appeal to the impartial World, whether they who endeavour all they can, to crush the Religion and Worship of that Church for which he died a *Martyr*, or we who endeavour as much to support it? whether they who trample upon the Royal Prerogative, (the Supremacy)? they who arrogate to themselves an absolute and independent Power, and, in the Exercise of this Power and Authority, openly break the Constitution of the Church, and violate the established Laws of the Kingdom? We say, we appeal to the impartial World, whether they or we deserve most to be compared to the Rebels in King *Charles I.*'s Time?

5. Another Charge is, Their disingenuous Behaviour, which we have experienced in some particular Persons; but, by what follows, it is evident that such a heavy Charge is justly to be imputed to all the *Usage-Clergy* in this Kingdom.

In the Year 1718, Mr. *Collier*, and others, published at *London*, what is intitled, *A new Communion-office, taken partly from primitive Liturgies, and partly from the first English Reformed Common Prayer Book: Together with Offices for Confirmation, and the Visitation of the Sick.*

Bp Gadderar, and his *Usage-breibren*, brought some hundred Copies of this *New Communion-office* from *England*, and dispersed them through this Kingdom, with Design to introduce it into the publick Worship. Which being known to the College of Bishops, they, in order to suppress all *Innovations*, emitted a *Formula*, which they ordered to be subscribed by all the Episcopal Clergy in the Nation. Bp Gadderar, being by this disappointed in his Project, and as he could not be reconciled with the *Communion-office* of the *Church of England*, craved the College of Bishops to allow him, and others who inclined to it, the Use of the *Scots Communion-office*; which the *College* granted. Accordingly a genuine Copy of the *Scots Communion-office* was published and dispersed. "But " [as Mr. *Dundass*, in his *Impartial Enquiry*, says] " that not an- " swering the Designs of the *Usage-men*, they drew up, and publish- " ed, and dispersed, a spurious and corrupt *Communion-office* of " their own, *falsely* intitling it, *The Communion-office for the Use of the Church of Scotland, autorised by King Charles I. anno 1636*; " wherein, by an abominable Crime of *Lese-Majesty*, they calum- " niated the glorious Memory of that Royal *Martyr*, fathering " their own Depravations upon his Authority, in order to palm " them upon the Nation with the less Suspicion."

The Depravations in that spurious Office will be evident to any who will compare it with the genuine one. Mr. *Dundass* has, in the above named Treatise, exposed severals of them.

Now, we think, that, by this Act of theirs, they not only, as Mr. *Dundass* justly observes, committed the abominable *Crime of Lese-Majesty*, but also that of deceiving Mankind, by imposing upon the World a real *Falshood*! Is that Religion which has for its Author the God of Truth, to be thus propagated? Did Jesus Christ or his Apostles use such Methods? But, *tempora mutantur*! They teach and maintain *Doctrines* different from (as certainly all unscriptural *Doctrines* are) those taught by Jesus Christ and his Apostles; and therefore take different Ways of propagating them. And may we not justly cry out, *O tempora! O mores!* Where shall we find sacred Truth? Where shall we find open and plain Dealing, if not among Bishops and Ministers of the Christian Church? Here we call to mind these Words of our Saviour, *For every one that doth evil, hateth the light, neither cometh to the light, lest his deeds should be reproved. But he that doth the truth, cometh to the light, that his deeds may be made manifest, that they are wrought of God*, John iii. 20. 21.

This is the spurious *Communion-office* which Mr. *Robertson* affirmed to be a genuine Copy of that in the *Scots Liturgy*, as mentioned p. 9. (Many Copies of which were dispersed through this Place soon after his Settlement; with what Design, we leave the

Reader

Reader to judge). It is what, by his own Acknowledgment, he used before he came here: and it is what is practised by almost all the *Usage* Clergy in this Kingdom: So that, when they are about to administer the holy Communion, they lay aside the *English* Liturgy, and take up this! And, by their so doing, they have, to our certain Knowledge, greatly disturbed the Devotion, and stumbled and offended the Consciences of many good Christians.

Besides using this spurious Communion-office, they innovate in the daily Offices: And it is very remarkable, that, though they all agree to mangle the Liturgy in the daily Offices, yet almost every one has his own particular Way of doing it. The *Primus*, amongst other *Mutilations*, in singing the *Te Deum*, and which he commonly does every Sunday and Holyday, leaveth off with the 18th Ver-
sicle, *viz. Thou sittest at the right hand of God, in the glory of the Fa-
ther.* So that here is omitted above one third.

A learned Author says of the *Te Deum*, “ I might easily enlarge upon the Excellency of this Hymn; but, being persuaded that no orthodox Christian can find fault with one Word in it, I will leave you to find out the Excellency of it, by a farther Acquaint-
ance with it.” Why Bp *Keith* should find fault with this ex-
cellent Hymn, we know not; but it is evident he does so, other-
wise why, in singing, does he leave out above one third of it? Some of his Brethren go such Lengths in their *Mutilations*, as to leave out the Commands, and to substitute in their Place the Sum of them, *Matth. xxii. 37, &c.*! Others of his Brethren make Ad-
ditions, as well as *Mutilations*, by adding their *Introits*, &c. Others, not contented with the *Decalogue* alone, add the Sum of the Com-
mands, *Matth. xxii. 37, &c.* And so of others.

Now, whence this differing among themselves? whence this Confusion? From a real Breach of settled Laws and Constitutions!

It must be allowed, that all Subjects, Bishops and Clergy, as well as others, are obliged to pay Obedience to the established Laws: That, according to these Laws, no private Pastor, no Bishop, nay not all the Bishops joined together, can, of themselves, alter, inno-
vate and maim an established Form of publick Worship; far less make new Liturgies, or new Canons and Constitutions.

It is certain, that settled Laws and Constitutions are as necessary for the Preservation of Peace and Order in Kingdoms, States and Societies, as Air is for the Preservation of Life; and, without a due Regard to these, Anarchy and Confusion must undoubtedly ensue.

Again, The disingenuous Behaviour of the *Usage* Bishops farther appears from the Manner in which they have observed the *Concordates*. Did they not, by these *Concordates*, bind themselves “ not to disturb the Peace of the Church, by introducing into the Wor-
ship thereof any of those ancient Usages, concerning which there

" hath been lately a Difference amongst us, and that they shall
" censure any of their Clergy that shall act otherwise?"

Now, how conscientiously have they kept these solemn Engagements? Nay, is there not too great Reason for saying, that they made use of them only as temporary Expedients for carrying on their Designs; for smothering the Usages, and the Differences occasioned thereby for a while, till an Opportunity should offer when they might break out again with more Violence, as they now actually have done?

Though the Usage-Clergy are now very numerous in this Kingdom, especially all over the Northern Parts; yet it gives great Satisfaction, to find, that it is quite otherwise in the Southern Parts, and that so considerable and learned a Body, the Presbyters of the Diocese of Edinburgh, have publickly remonstrated against all Innovations, either in the Polity, Doctrine, or Worship of the Church.

The late Bp Rankin, who well knew the Doctrines and Practices of the Usage-men, and was a melancholy Witness of the sad Effects of them, did, out of a charitable View of composing the woful Differences, in the Year 1728, publish a small Treatise, intituled, *The antiquated Usages which have made so great a Noise amongst us, briefly examined, and found insufficient to justify the zealous Endeavours of some Persons to introduce them.* In which Treatise the Right Reverend Author says, "It is evident, that they of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland, both Clergy and Laity, did enjoy profound Peace and Tranquillity amongst themselves with respect to religious Matters, until some Persons, by a most unwarrantable Zeal, did advance and propagate certain Opinions and Practices concerning some antiquated Usages; namely, *The mixing Water with the Wine in the holy Sacrament of the Supper, Prayer for the Dead, &c.* Likewise it is well known, what irregular Steps these Persons have made for increasing their Power in this Church, and carrying on their innovating and divisive Designs and Practices. Yet, after all they have done, if they, and the Clergy whom they influence, will be so kind to themselves, and this afflicted Church bleeding in her Wounds, as to return to the State she was in, as to her sacred Offices, before the Commencement of these Divisions; and if they shall forbear the above mentioned Usages, particularly in the present Circumstances of this Church: then, in that Case, I am fully persuaded, that they who justly stand up against the reintroducing these, and for the Peace of the Church settled upon sure and good Grounds, will be ready, with open Arms, to embrace them as Brethren; and also to propose or hearken to all proper and reasonable Overtures for removing other Differences.

" And now it might be reasonably expected, that they should at length, upon more calm and serious Thoughts, relent, and desist

" from

“ from pursuing their former Courses : And that a due Regard to those divine Commands, which so frequently and seriously recommend Peace and Unity, and to that admirable fervent Prayer, which our blessed Lord, a little before his Death, put up to his Father, for the Concord and good Agreement of the Apostles among themselves, and among those who should believe in him through their Ministry ; it might, I say, be expected, that a REGARD to those Commands, and that Prayer, together with a sincere Respect to the Welfare of this Church, to the earnest Wishes of many worthy Members of her Communion, and to the Protestant Churches, and more especially to the Church of *England*, should incline them to return to the Ways of Peace ; and, in order to it, to sacrifice their ill-grounded Opinions and Practices.”

In his Conclusion, where he addresses himself to his Brethren the Clergy, he has these Words : “ And let us all wisely consider the sad Effects of these Divisions, how they have deeply wounded our Mother, extremely grieved the Hearts of her loving Children, and raised unchristian Animosities amongst Brethren, who formerly dwelt together in Unity ; how our holy Religion is dis-honoured by them, and we ourselves exposed to the Derision of Adversaries on all Sides. Let us reflect, that the introducing into our sacred Offices these *antiquated Rites and Practices*, would frighten many of the Episcopal Communion from it, and Protestants not already in it, from coming over thereto.” —

And, in his Address to the *Laity*, he says, “ I do next address myself to you, much honoured and dearly beloved, who are of the Episcopal Communion in *Scotland*, entreating you, by the most affectionate Love, to demean yourselves as it becomes you, in the present Circumstances of the afflicted Church whereof you are Members.

“ As to you who have been zealous hitherto for her Peace and Unity, and do steadily adhere to her Communion, in the Exercise of her religious Offices and Worship, as they were in use before these melancholy Divisions did arise ; I exhort you to continue firm and constant, as being fully persuaded that you are in the right.

“ As for you who have too easily been led away, by the *insinuating* and *industrious* Endeavours of those who have been so instrumental in these Disturbances which prevail amongst us, and who, with such a warm Zeal, have recommended to you some Opinions and Practices which do not deserve it ; I importunately beg it of you, calmly to consider what you have done, and impartially to review and examine these Reasons which have prevailed with you to give into these Measures you have lately taken ; and that, in the mean time, until more of this Subject may fall into

" your Hands, you may kindly and seriously consider what is offered to you in this Paper, from a Principle of pure and disinterested Charity. And may it, by the Blessing of God, contribute to clear you of your Prejudices, to deliver you from an undue Respect of Persons in a Matter where Truth and Peace are so much concerned, and to reconcile you to the sacred Offices of this Church, without the Addition of the above mentioned antiquated Usages."

Thus far that pious orthodox Prelate.

We shall conclude with the Words of our excellent Liturgy, in heartily praying, *That it may please almighty God, to forgive our Enemies, Persecuters, and Slanderers, and to turn their Hearts.* And, " O almighty God, who hast instructed thy holy Church with the heavenly Doctrine of thy Evangelists, give us Grace, that, being not like Children carried away with every Blast of vain Doctrine, we may be established in the Truth of thy holy Gospel, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

A N

APPENDIX;

CONTAINING,

Some Remarks upon Part of an anonymous Pamphlet, intitled, *An instructed historical Account of the Settlement in the Episcopal Congregation of Dundee in 1727, &c.*

Remark 1. IT is said, in this anonymous Pamphlet, p. 49. lin. penult. I shall not affirm as to this, what common Fame has published, &c. As to which, we ingenuously confess, that, excepting what is mentioned from Mr. Fife, the Performance is entirely our own, and that we never intended it should be wrote by Mr. Dundass, or any other.

Remark 2. When we applied to Bp Raitt for his Concurrence in Mr. Robertson's Settlement as one of our Ministers, and as Successor to Bp Ouchterlonie, it is said, p. 51. *lin. penult.* Which Mr. Raitt, —upon their Application to him, showed himself very ready to gratify, though he knew nothing about Mr. Robertson, but that he was their Choice. Now, may we not reasonably ask Mr. Raitt, why did he not gratify us in our Choice of Mr. Fife, seeing he knew him to be blameless in his Life and Conversation?

Remark 3. Pag. 52, par. 3. As to the Assurance there said to be had from Mr. Irvine, we have mentioned p. 33. and again repeat it here, That we know very well what Mr. Irvine's Opinion as to that Affair was at that Time: So that all we shall add farther, is, We sincerely believe Mr. Irvine was neither a Trimmer nor Dissembrler.

Remark 4. Pag. 56. last par. it is said, *By the same Vouchers it appears, that they came to a Resolution from henceforth to give Mr. Robertson no more Stipend.* As to this, we are persuaded, that none but the Author, or such as he, will see any such Appearance from these Vouchers; and it is very certain, that no such Resolution was made, till after Mr. Robertson had deserted us.

Again, p. 57. it is said, " And that they might be afterwards the more liberal, they resolve to begin with being very saving: For, though they absented after this from publick Worship, they constantly deputed one to take care of the Bag; which however they disposed of, no Part of it came to the Behoof of Mr. Robertson." As to this, we have mentioned, in our *Narrative*, that many of us did

did absent ourselves ; and that the Reason of our so doing was on account of Mr. Robertson's strange *Innovations*, and as strange *Dissimulation*. But for the Author to assert, that no Part of the *Bag* came to Mr. Robertson's Behoof, is indeed very surprising ! For Proof of the contrary of this Assertion, we shall here insert a holograph Writ of Mr. Robertson's, as follows.

" *Dundee, June 20. 1743.* Received from *Charles Farquharson*,
" present Treasurer to the *Seagate Meeting-house*, the Sum of Ten
" Pounds *Sterling*, and that as a Quarter's Stipend (*viz.* from
" *March* the twenty second to the twenty second instant) due to
" me.

(Sign'd) WIL. ROBERTSON."

Now, Mr. Robertson could not be ignorant that this Receipt is a considerable Time posterior to our absenting ourselves ; for severals of the Congregation did so, immediately after *Easter*, and a great many of us after the *Sunday before Pentecost*.

We acknowledge, that, when Mr. Robertson, some time after he had deserted us, did, by his *Confident*, make a Demand of one Month's Stipend, *viz.* from the 22d *June* to the 22d *July*, we then, indeed, resolved to give him no more Stipend ; and that for this Reason, (laying aside the *Desertion*), *viz.* Because, though he had officiated only seven Months, *viz.* from the 22d *December 1742*, the Date of his *Settlement*, to the 24th *July 1743*, the Date of his *Desertion* ; yet we had actually paid him eight Months Stipend, besides a Gratuity of ten Pounds *Sterling* for defraying the Charges of his *Transportation*.

Remark 5. Pag. 58. it is said, " The Bishop gave them for Answer, " That he was sorry, not only that he could not concur in their *Proposal*, " Mr. Fife having no *dimissory Letters* from the *District* he was to " leave, &c." Here the Author misrepresents the Fact, as indeed he does in many other Instances. We have mentioned, *p. 44.* that when we presented the Call to Bishop *Raitt*, he did not, as we expected, desire us to procure the Consent of any other Bishop or Bishops for Mr. *Fife's Removal* ; and we here again affirm, that he made not the least mention of *dimissory Letters*. His only reason for not concurring in the Call, we have narrated *p. 24.* If such Consent was necessary, in order to Mr. *Fife's Removal*, why did not Bp *Raitt* desire us to procure it ? We knew he had desired another to procure the Consent of the Provincial Bishops ; we certainly expected he would have done so by us, and were actually resolved, for Peace sake, to have asked it, had they been double the Number. We think there needs no great Depth of Judgment to give a Reason why Bp *Raitt* did not desire us to ask and procure such Consent, Because it would have been so far a concurring in the *Settlement*.

Remark

Remark 6. Pag. 66. it is said,— “ Two of the assistant Bishops had a Meeting that Evening with as many Agents of the *Seagate* Meeting-house ; but they could bring them to no Terms nor Temper, having found, in a long Conversation with them, little Reason, and no Principle ; but all Humour, and inflexible personal Pique and Resentment : So that they were clearer for inflicting the utmost Censure upon the Man who had fed them up “ in these, than before.” Here again the Author greatly misrepresents the Fact. After the two Gentlemen had parted with the Bishops, they met with severals of us that same Night, when we observed Joy in their Faces ; and they, after relating the Conversation, made those who heard them equally happy, with the most agreeable Prospect of a happy and speedy Conclusion to all our Differences ; and many of us were, early next Morning, acquainted with the agreeable News. Surely it can never be imagined, that the two Gentlemen, our Fellow-sufferers, could have any Design of imposing upon us, when they assured us, that the two Bishops and they had perfectly agreed in what they then related ; and that the Prelates told them, they did not doubt but Bp *Raitt* would likewise agree. We must therefore believe, either that Bps *Falconar* and *Alexander* acted a most hypocritical and disingenuous Part, or that this latent Author has done the two Prelates very great Injustice. But indeed we are convinced of the latter, and very far from believing the former : On the contrary, we have good Reason to believe, that, when the two Bishops related that Evening’s Conversation in Bp *Raitt*’s House, they were very far from representing the two Agents in so black Colours as the Author has done ; and that they were for much milder Measures than those taken by Bp *Raitt* and his Court. Nay, we are persuaded, that, had the others who did sit in that Court, been of like Temper and Disposition with these two Prelates, much Disturbance and Division might have been prevented.

We had seen and read both the Evening and next Morning’s Conversation, at full length, as set down by the Gentlemen, that same Day Bp *Raitt* pronounced his Sentence : And we declare, the only Reason why we did not insert them in the *Narrative*, was on account of the two Bishops. However, we hope they will excuse us for inserting them here.

Abstract of the Evening Conversation, as set down by the two Gentlemen.

“ The Evening of the 31st August 1743, we had a Meeting in the Coffee-house with Bishops *Falconar* and *Alexander* ; and, after mutual Compliments, the Bishops were pleased to tell us, they were come from Bp *Raitt* as Messengers of Peace between him and

“ and our Congregation. We assured them, that they would find our Congregation most ready and willing to embrace the Offers of Peace ; that we wished and wanted much to live in Peace and Unity with Bp Raitt, and to pay him all dutiful Respect and Regard as our Bishop, and that we had often declared so to himself.

“ After talking over the whole Affair with regard to the unlucky Differences, and after we had convinced the Bishops of several Facts that had been misrepresented to them, particularly concerning the projected Union, the Bishops were pleased to ask, *What Terms do ye think your Congregation would require, in order to a Peace and Reconciliation with Bp Raitt?* We assured them that our Congregation would go all reasonable Lengths in order to procure so desirable an Event ; and, since they were pleased to desire our Opinion, we would venture to name what we believed our Congregation would agree to, *viz.* 1. That we have always declared ourselves to be of the Communion of the Church of *England*; that that Liturgy has been always practised amongst us ; that we, from a thorough Conviction, believe it the best ; and that it is our utmost Wish and Desire to continue in that Communion. To which the Bishops were pleased to say, *You are in the right to adhere to that Communion and Worship, since you are convinced it is the best ; and it was wrong in any Man, to endeavour to force a different Form of Worship upon you.* 2. As Mr. Robertson has again and again absolutely refused to practise the Liturgy of the Church of *England* as directed by the Rubricks, (nay, he told us he would not comply with the *Scots* Liturgy) ; and as he has, by his disingenuous Behaviour, &c. made us justly conceive such an Opinion of him, as we all reckon our Congregation could not be easy or happy under his Ministrations : we therefore publickly owned, that his leaving us gave great Relief to our Minds ; and consequently we neither wished nor wanted his Return. On the other hand, we, being altogether satisfied with Mr. Fife, with respect to both his moral Character and orthodox Principles, are most desirous he should continue settled amongst us. To which the Bishops said, *Since that is the Case, we think what you ask reasonable.* 3. After our happy Reconciliation (which we heartily wish may be soon) with Bp Raitt, if the Bishop should, at any time, think fit to come to our Meeting-house, and officiate at reading of Prayers, or administering the holy Sacrament of our Lord's Supper, that he would please perform according to the Liturgy of the Church of *England*. To this Proposal the two Bishops were pleased to agree.

“ Then the two Prelates asked us, *Do ye think that Mr. Fife will own himself in the wrong to Bp Raitt, for settling in your Meeting-*

“ ing-

Now
tween t
the disc
it by th
Prelates
pacifick
next M
diators

ing-house without his Consent ; that he will ask the Bishop's Pardon, and afterwards sign canonical Obedience ? To which we answered, We will undertake, that Mr. Fife, as a good Man, and a good Christian, will do every thing reasonable, in order to procure Peace : That, if he has justly offended Bp Raitt, he will ask Pardon, and intreat a Reconciliation. As to canonical Obedience, it must be confidered, that Mr. Fife has always declared himself to be of the Communion of the Church of *England* ; that he has always practised that Liturgy ; and that he has sign-ed the *Formula* against the *Usages* : In every thing consistent with these, we will venture to undertake, that Mr. Fife shall sign canonical Obedience. To which the Bishops said, That no farther would be asked of Mr. Fife. Indeed the two Prelates heartily agreed to all the above ; and were pleased to say, We do not doubt but Bp Raitt will likewise agree ; but we will not answer for Mr. Robertson.

After this the Bishops said, Gentlemen, in order to bring this Affair to a happy Period, we desire to have a Meeting with you, and one or two more of your Managers, to-morrow Morning at nine, as we are to meet with Bp Raitt, and the rest of our Brethren, at ten ; and we intreat, that those you bring along with you, may be Men of Temper like yourselves, that there may be no Fangling or Heats amongst us. To this we heartily agreed.

We asked the Bishops to stay Supper ; but they could not, being engaged to Bp Raitt. We called for a Bottle of Wine, drank the two Bishops Healths, then to Bp Raitt's, then Success to their blessed Undertaking, and to Peace and Unity in the Church. We accompanied the two Prelates to Bp Raitt's Door, begged they would please give our most humble Service to the Bishop, and so wished them a good Night.

The two Gentlemen appeal to Bps Falconar and Alexander for the Truth of the above Narration.

We acknowledge, that the above Conversation gave us great Pleasure and Satisfaction. We were indeed very happy, and made several others no less so that same Night, with the pleasing View of a speedy and happy Issue to all our Differences."

Now, after this fair Relation of that Evening-conversation, between the two *assistant* Bishops, and the two *Agents*, we leave it to the discerning World to judge, what a strange *Perversion* is made of it by this latent Author ! We are firmly persuaded, that the two Prelates were altogether sincere in their charitable and well-meant pacifick Intentions ; and we have good Reason to believe they were, next Morning, diverted from these their pious Intentions, as Mediators and Peace-makers, by the Advice and Persuasion of those

who, it would appear, were, at that Time, governed more by Passion, Prejudice, and a Spirit of Resentment, than by the meek Spirit of the Gospel ; and therefore resolved to push Matters to the utmost Extremity.

Follows the Morning-conversation.

" Next Morning at nine, we two, in conjunction with one other Manager, went to the Place appointed ; where we staid above half an Hour, then sent to let the two Bishops know we were waiting them, and that Breakfast was ready. The two Prelates accordingly came ; and, immediately after Breakfast, we addressed them, hoping that Bp Raitt had agreed with them in what passed last Night. The Bishops, without further arguing, said, *Bp Raitt insists, as a preliminary Article, That ye should give up Mr. Fife altogether, and call another ; and that Mr. Fife shall submit himself to his Disposal.* We, in return, said, This is quite different from what ye were pleased to agree to last Night. We are sorry Bp Raitt insists upon such a Preliminary, because we think the Congregation cannot, in Honour or Justice, comply with it : For (said we) you will please consider, that we, in virtue of our undoubted Right as Patrons, gave a regular Call to Mr. Fife, which he accepted ; that all the seven Managers, and seven eighths of the whole Congregation, are concurring in the Call, and that we have done every Thing incumbent upon us for his regular Settlement ; in consequence of which, we received Mr. Fife as one of our settled Ministers, and engaged our Word, our Writ, and our Honour, to support and adhere to him as such : And, after this, would it be reasonable, just or honourable in us, to give him up, to desert him, and throw him destitute, without a just Cause ? If Mr. Fife has injured Bp Raitt, we have undertaken, that he shall give all reasonable Satisfaction ; which is all you asked and agreed to last Night, and which, we humbly think, is all any reasonable Man can desire. But (replied the Bishops) Bp Raitt insists, *That Mr. Fife cannot make sufficient Satisfaction and Restitution, except what he demands be complied with.* To this we rejoined, When we presented our Call, with the Acceptance, to Bp Raitt, he made no Objection to Mr. Fife's Life and Conversation, to his Doctrine or Sufficiency ; and, for our part, we are well pleased and satisfied with Mr. Fife : Why then should Bp Raitt desire us to give him up, and to desert him ? Why will he insist upon our doing what we think would be both dishonourable and unjust ? But all we could say was to no Purpose ; for the Prelates again said, *We believe nothing will satisfy Bp Raitt, but an immediate Compliance with his Demands.*

" As

“ As the Bishops were going away, we begged and intreated them to use their good Offices with Bp *Raitt*, in order to prevail with him to acquiesce in what they were pleased to agree to last Night. We assured them that our Congregation should, by a solemn Deputation, most earnestly intreat Bp *Raitt* to be reconciled with Mr. *Fife* and us, upon the Terms agreed to in last Night’s Conversation: Nay further, that we should, in order to procure Peace, join with Mr. *Fife* in offering all reasonable Satisfaction.

“ Thus the two Messengers of Peace, left us three Managers, and the Landlady, who was also witness to this second Conversation.

“ The three Gentlemen appeal to the two Bishops for the Truth of this second Narration.”

Now, with regard to these two Conversations, we appeal to all the Unprejudiced, whether or not our three Managers went sufficient Lengths in order to procure Peace? and whether we might not have reasonably expected to have seen the two Bishops, at least once more, as Mediators and Peace-makers?

Remark 7. Pag. 66. is a Letter signed by Mr. *Thomas Blair*: Which Letter seems to have been contrived for the Foundation and Superstructure of the projected *Union*. We are much surprised with the Contents; and no less so, at Mr. *Blair*’s allowing himself to be the Author of it. But we shall willingly grant him the same Excuse, as is mentioned p. 22. when he privately inserted in our Book, the Minute of Sederunt made by the two Committees the 11th April 1743; because we believe the same Influence prompted him to both. The Letter is as follows; and, for the greater Per-spicuity, we chuse to number the Paragraphs.

1.—“ On the Sunday after *Easter*, the Heads of Families of the *Seagate* House being met, their Managers (of whom I then was one) acquainted them of a Message they had received from the Bishop, by the Managers of his House; wherein he earnestly desired an Union of the two Congregations, and recommended it to them (as a Thing he had much at Heart) to be concerted with us, in the Manner most agreeable for both.

2. “ Our Congregation ordered their Managers, with the following Gentlemen, — to wait on the Managers of the Bishop’s House, to see what Authority they had to treat, and what Proposals they had to make, and report.

3. “ Next Day we met with said Managers, and found they had not only the Bishop’s Authority for the Union, but the unanimous Consent of their own Congregation, in a Sederunt for that Purpose. They proposed, that the Bishop and Mr. *Robertson* should,

“ should, in the mean time, officiate in one another’s Houses, as they should agree betwixt themselves, until such Time as a convenient House could be found to contain both Congregations.

4. “ This being so reasonable, we readily agreed to it, not only for ourselves, but taking burden upon us for the whole Congregation, as we would not have an Opportunity of calling them together till *Sunday* next, when we thought the Bishop should officiate in our House for the first Time.

5. “ We instantly made a Sederunt, in terms of the above Agreement, which was dictated by Mr. *Brisbane*, one of our Managers, wrote by our own Clerk, signed by me as Preses, in their Presence, and at their Desire; and was delivered to *Nevay*: Who, with *Peter Ouchterlonie*, (another of our Managers), was desired to wait of the Bishop, and show this Sederunt, that he might be acquainted with our Sentiments.

6. “ The *Sunday* following, our Congregation being again met, I reported the Contents of the above Sederunt; which was so far agreed to, that not one Man made an Objection to, or disapproved of any Article in it. On the contrary, the Managers, and other Gentlemen, were hereby exonerated of their Engagement; so that the Sederunt became a Deed of the Congregation’s.

7. “ Same Day I acquainted them, that the Managers of the Bishop’s House had recommended it to us as a proper Thing, that our Congregation should name four or five of their Number, to meet with them when thought convenient, to fall on Ways and Means for providing a House to contain both Congregations. To this Objections were made, and some Disputes arose; which all terminated in this, That, since the Managers had hitherto taken the Trouble of every thing of that kind, they ought to continue so to do. But neither this Power given to the Managers, nor the Congregation’s Approbation of the Sederunt before mentioned, nor any Sederunt held in the Meeting-house since Mr. *Robertson*’s coming, (so far as I remember), were ever committed to Writing. However, Mr. *Brisbane*, *Peter Ouchterlonie*, and I, had afterwards a Meeting in the Coffee-house, with the Gentlemen of the other House, on the Subject of raising Funds for building a House; when *Nevay* was desired to inquire into the Constitution of Mr. *Harper*’s House in *Edinburgh*, to see if thereby we could give any body satisfactory Security, that he should be willing to advance Money to carry on the Work.”

From this Letter we make the following Remarks.

1. In par. 2. it is said, *to see what Authority they had to treat*. Mr. *Blair* is wrong as to this Expression: For all the Power given to our Committee, was, *To learn what Proposals they of the*

the other House had to make for an Union ; and to make a Report.

2. In par. 4. it is said, *This being so reasonable, &c.* This is indeed speciously said : But we shall leave our Reader to judge of the Candidness of the Expression, when we tell him, that two thirds of that our Committee will still own, what they have all along done, *viz.* that the only Burden they took upon themselves, was, that of acting beyond the Powers granted them ; that the Agreement they made was rash and unwarrantable ; that all they meant or intended by it, was, That Bp *Raith* might read Prayers or preach in our Meeting-house when he pleased, and might order Mr. *Robertson* to do the same in his House ; and that, if they took any Burden upon them for the Congregation, it was a very light one, being only this, *they believed the Congregation would agree, that Bp Raith might read Prayers or preach in our Meeting-house when he pleased ; and might order Mr. Robertson to do the same in his House*, as mentioned p. 14. As to the Expression, *As we would not have an Opportunity of calling them together till Sunday next* ; we cannot help saying, it is a mere Pretence : For Mr. *Blair* knows, that our Sexton has gone round in advertising the Heads of Families in a Morning ; and that same Afternoon, at two, three, or four o'Clock, was held a Meeting of them. That this has frequently happened, must consist with his particular Knowledge. Whatever Knowledge or Thought Mr. *Blair* might have concerning Bp *Raith*'s officiating in our House next Sunday, we shall not say ; but it is certain we knew nothing of it till the Event happened.

3. In par. 5. it is said, *We instantly made a Sederunt in Terms of the above Agreement, &c.* As to the Expression, *wrote by our own Clerk*, if he means our then Treasurer, who, *ex officio*, is always our Clerk, he is wrong ; if he means one chosen by the Committees, we must take leave to tell Mr. *Blair*, that the Meeting was not regularly constituted by chusing either Preses or Clerk, and that he himself acted in both Capacities. As to Mr. *Ouchterlonie*'s going to Bp *Raith*'s House along with *Neway*, it was not in Quality of a Deputy from the Meeting, but at the earnest Desire of *Bandeau*, and others ; they having heard Mr. *Ouchterlonie* remonstrating against an Union, and giving several Reasons for his so doing, such as, "That " Bp *Raith* would give us no Assurance, that we, after an Union, " should continue to enjoy the Worship and Communion of the " Church of *England*, &c." they desired he would go to the Bishop, who probably would satisfy his Scruples ; which, in the Course of the Conversation betwixt him and Mr. *Ouchterlonie*, he by no means did.

4. In par. 6. *The Sunday following, our Congregation being met, &c.* If Mr. *Blair* intended to have made a regular Report of this Sederunt, he ought to have laid before the Congregation the Sederunt itself ;

self; but this he never did: How then could the Congregation approve or disapprove of any Article of a Thing they had never seen? It is true, they had heard in the general, that their Committee had unwarrantably made such an Agreement; and Mr. Blair well knew, that the Congregation in general were very much displeased at their Committee, and therefore was wise enough not to lay the *Sederunt* before them. In short, we affirm, that this *Sederunt* was never in the keeping of our Treasurer, in whose Custody our Book and other Papers are; that it was never laid before a general Meeting, nor were its Contents fully known to the Congregation till after it was clandestinely inserted in our Book; and then it met with its deserved Fate, as mentioned p. 23.

But Mr. Blair says, *he reported the Contents of the Sederunt*. After what Manner did he that? Why, truly, just as we have mentioned, p. 15. viz. *That, as the two Committees had agreed, that the Bishop and Mr. Robertson should officiate in one another's Houses, till a House, sufficient to accommodate both Congregations could be got; he therefore proposed, that the Meeting should immediately appoint a Committee, who, in conjunction with the Bishop's Managers, might settle upon a House, or a Spot of Ground whereon to build one, sufficient to accommodate both Congregations.* Now, we declare, that this is all the Report Mr. Blair made; and indeed he behoved naturally to make such a Preamble to the Proposal he was about to make to the Meeting.

We have now seen all the Report made by Mr. Blair, and we shall grant him, that there was no particular Notice taken of the *Sederunt* at that Meeting: But will any candid and fair Judge say, that the Congregation's Silence at that Time, as to the *Sederunt* in general, or as to any one particular Article in it, was an Approbation of the *Sederunt*, and such an Homologation as rendered it a Deed of the Congregation's? Surely no. Had Mr. Blair produced the *Sederunt*, and laid it before the Congregation; and had he made a full and fair Report of it in this Manner, Gentlemen, *This is the Sederunt made by the two Committees such a Day.* It is very true, that your Committee did, in this Matter, exceed the Powers granted them; and in so far acted un-warrantably; so that the Agreement is only a Deed of theirs: You'll therefore please consider, whether you are to approve of this *Sederunt*, so as to make it become a Deed of the Congregation's; or whether you are to disapprove of, and reject it altogether: We say, had Mr. Blair acted so regular a Part; and if, after his doing so, the Congregation had been silent, he would have had some Pretence for advancing what he does.

Though the Congregation, in general, were, from the Beginning, very much displeased at their Committee for that unwarrantable Agreement; yet they always, and that most justly too, looked upon the Agreement itself as of no Force or Moment, as being no

Deed

Deed of the Congregation's, consequently could never be binding upon them. And indeed, the Congregation regarded it so little, that they took no Manner of Notice of it, (further than being angry with their Committee), till after it was clandestinely inserted in our Book; and then they noticed it in a publick Manner: So that the first Time this Sederunt was in any Shape laid before the Congregation, (*viz.* the 24th June), they were so far from approving of, and homologating it, so as to render it a Deed of the Congregation's, (as the Author of this Letter asserts), that, on the contrary, they almost unanimously reversed and rescinded it, as mentioned p. 23.

Now, though the Congregation, at the above Meeting, took no particular Notice of the Sederunt; yet we hope Mr. Blair will not say that we were silent as to the projected Union. He himself acknowledges, in the 7th Paragraph, that there were *Objections*, and some *Disputes*. *Pag. 16.* (where that Matter is fairly represented), we have narrated some of our then Reasonings against the *Union*, and shall again relate them here. And, first, we asked Mr. Blair, and the rest of Mr. Robertson's Party, *What have been our Objections all along against Mr. Raith?* Are these *Objections removed, nay, do not they visibly subsist?* Are they not known to us all, and have we no fresh Instances of their subsisting? Consequently, we have still the same, if not more and greater Reasons for not uniting with his Congregation now, than we have had for these sixteen or seventeen Years past. And, till these *Objections* are removed, we ought not, nay, we cannot, consistently with our avowed Principles, make an *Union*. Now, the *Objections* visibly subsisting are plainly these: Are we not all convinced that Bp Raith is a real Encourager and Promoter of the *Usages*? And have we not an immediate Proof of his being so, by his supporting and encouraging Mr. Robertson in his *Innovations*? And further, has Bp Raith given us any Security, that we, after uniting with his Congregation, shall enjoy the Worship and Communien of the Church of *England*? On the contrary, has he not refused to give us any such Security? and does he not reckon us most assuming for pretending to ask any such Assurance?

Again, as mentioned *p. 16.* we told Mr. Blair, &c. *That we were credibly informed, there was to be a Meeting of the Bishops at Edinburgh in June, in order to make a Review of the Liturgy; and therefore we were altogether against making any Step towards an Union, till we should see the Issue of that Meeting.* Now, it is certain, that such a Meeting was intended; and, as we had undoubted Information of it, that, with former Reasons, absolutely determined us to make no Step towards an *Union*, till we should see the Issue of the Meeting.

As to the Power said (*par. 7.*) to be given to the Managers, we have mentioned, *p. 16* and here again repeat it, *That the Meeting*

ing came to no Conclusion, as to any one single Step towards an Union; consequently there was no Power given either to Managers or others in that respect.

It is said, par. 7. However, Mr. Brisbane, Peter Ouchterlonie, and I, had afterwards a Meeting in the Coffee-house, with the Gentlemen of the other House, &c.

As to this, Mr. Brisbane and Mr. Ouchterlonie both own they were at such a Meeting; but that they went thither at Mr. Blair's Desire, and not by any Commission or Authority from the Congregation; and therefore they made no Account of what was transacted in the Meeting. And, for our part, we declare, that, except Mr. Brisbane and Mr. Ouchterlonie, very few or none of our Congregation knew there had been any such Meeting, till we saw it mentioned in this printed Letter.

As Mr. Blair, in this Letter, labours and strains so hard to fix the projected Union upon us, we must take leave to ask him this Question, *viz.* When the Congregation were going on in Mr. Fife's Call and Settlement, (about which there were many Meetings, and several regular Sederunts), did ever Mr. Blair, or any other of Mr. Robertson's Party, make the least Objection to any of these Steps on account of an Union? He knows they never did. Again, when we several times told Mr. Robertson, we were to call another Minister as Successor to Mr. Irvine, did ever he make any Objection on account of an Union? And again, when we went to Bp Raitt, desiring he would lay his Commands on Mr. Robertson to practise the Liturgy as directed by the Rubrics; he never made the least Mention of an Union. In short, (excepting the clandestine Insertion of the Sederunt in our Book, and what followed thereupon), we never heard any thing more of the projected Union, till the 15th July, when we presented our Call to Bp Raitt, asking his Concurrence. Then indeed Bp Raitt was pleased to insist upon the Union, as mentioned p. 24. And the only Reason we can possibly assign for his so doing, is, because he had no other colourable Pretence for opposing Mr. Fife's Settlement.

“ Now as concerning Mr. Fife. Pag. 59, the Communing which
 “ Mr. Fife had with the three Ministers at his House of Glenboy is
 “ very much misrepresented. Mr. Fife told these Gentlemen, That
 “ he could give no other Return to what they said, than this, That,
 “ when he came to Dundee, he would narrowly inquire into these
 “ Things, and particularly concerning the Union: In the mean time,
 “ he sincerely believed, that the Gentlemen of the Seagate Congregation
 “ who communed with him, would not impose upon him, or any Man;
 “ and he was persuaded, that that Congregation would not have gi-
 “ ven him a Call to be one of their Pastors, had there been an Union.

“ That

" That Mr. Fife promised *first of all to wait of Mr. Raitt and Mr. Robertson*, is wrong ; Mr. Fife's Intention being always first to wait on the Gentlemen who had given him the Call, and with whom his principal Concern was : And, after perusing the Seditious recorded in their Book, he plainly saw there was no Union between the two Congregations.

" As to Mr. Fife's Conversation with Mr. Raitt, p. 59. 60. it is fully as much misrepresented as the above. There were two Gentlemen of Honour Witnesses to Part of it, and Mr. Fife acquainted the Gentlemen of his Congregation with the Remainder. An Abstract of the whole is inserted in their *Narrative*.

" Pag. 68. is a Letter from William Gammock, narrating, *That Mr. Fife had deserted his Charge at Glamis, without telling any of that Congregation of his doing so.* This is dealing very unjustly with Mr. Fife : For, on the 10th of July 1743, Mr. Fife officiated at Glamis in the Afternoon ; and, Prayers and Sermon being over, he called a Meeting of his Elders, (whose Names and Designations are, John Johnston Merchant in Glamis, Charles Scot Brewer, Patrick Fife Mason, and Alexander Martin Taylor), and acquainted them, *that, on the 24th of this instant, he was to enter on his Charge at Dundee, as one of the Ministers of the Seagate Congregation* ; *and therefore he was to give up this his present Charge.* Three of these honest Men are still living, to whom Mr. Fife appeals for the Truth of this. But further, Mr. Fife was, next Sunday, to have acquainted all that Part of his Country-charge with his Intention of settling at Dundee ; but, being distressed, he could not go thither the 17th, in order to officiate ; and therefore sent a Letter, by Express, to the Managers of the Seagate Congregation, intreating they would dispense with him for one Sunday more. Their Answer to which was, *That they could not possibly comply with his Desire in that respect.* So that it was Mr. Fife's Misfortune, not his Fault, that the People in Glamis were not publicly advertised from the Pulpit of his Design of leaving them. Mr. Fife, being very uneasy at this unfair Dealing of his Adversaries, wrote to the three surviving Elders, desiring they would do him Justice in that Affair. From two of whom he received the following Letter.

" Reverend SIR,

" We received your's, dated 6th of this Month ; and both of us own, that you did call and told us, and the rest of your Elders, that you was to leave us against the 24th of July 1743. This you told on the 10th of the same Month : Which News was not agreeable to us, nor to any of your Hearers. We are very sorry, that any Reports from this Place should make you uneasy ; for we assure you, that your

" Ministry was always most agreeable to us: Therefore we pray God
" almighty to bless you, and all your's, where-ever you go. We are
" with very much Respect,

Reverend SIR,

Your obliged and very obedient and bumble Servants,

Glams,
8th April 1745.

(Sign'd) PAT. FYFF.

CHARLES SCOTT.

" A few Days thereafter, Mr. Fife received a Letter to the same
" Purpose, from Alexander Martin, the other surviving Elder.

" Pag. 100. it is said, That Mr. Fife had always been in use of
" adding the Invocation of the Holy Ghost to the Prayer of Consecra-
" tion. As to which, Mr. Fife appeals to all who ever communi-
" cated with him, if ever he made the least Alteration in the Prayer
" of Consecration; but pronounced it according to the very Form
" of the Liturgy of the Church of England. Mr. Fife owns, that,
" immediately after the Prayer of Consecration, he had been in use
" to read the first Prayer of the Post-communion; and that from
" the Example of both Bps Norie and Ouchterlonie. However,
" when Mr. Fife understood, that the Usage-party made such a
" Handle of, and put such a Construction upon this Alteration,
" viz. That whoever tacked the first Prayer of the Post-commu-
" nion to the Prayer of Consecration, behoved to look upon the
" Eucharist as a true real propitiatory and expiatory Sacrifice, he
" thought proper to lay aside that Alteration. Mr. Fife declares,
" as he has formerly done, That the Liturgy of the Church of Eng-
" land is, in his Opinion, the best Form of publick Devotion in the
" Christian World; that it is compleat in all its Parts; and there-
" fore he most willingly (at the Desire of his present Congregati-
" on, before they signed his Call) gave a Writ under his Hand, ob-
" liging himself to practise that Liturgy, without any Innovation
" or Alteration.

" Again, p. 100. it is objected, That Mr. Fife has a slender Re-
" gard to the English Liturgy, in that he prefers his private Con-
" ceptions before it: And that not only Marriage, but even Baptism has
" been and still is more commonly performed—without it, than in any
" other Episcopal Congregation in the Country. As to this, Mr. Fife
" declares, That there is none who has it more at heart, to per-
" form all sacred Offices by the excellent Forms of that Church,
" than himself. If Mr. Fife, in administering Baptism, is some-
" times obliged to comply with the Inclinations of some (especi-
" ally those of the lower Rank) to perform it, not exactly accord-
" ing to this excellent Form, it is well known, that it is such a
" Compliance as Mr. Raitt and all the Episcopal Ministers in this
" Kingdom are obliged, sometimes, to make: And therefore, if
" it

“ it be a Failure or Fault in Mr. Fife, it is equally so in the rest of his Brethren. So that Mr. Fife’s Adversaries, by venting their Spleen against him in this respect, do thereby propale their own Faults or Failures.

“ At the Foot of p. 105. it is said, *And for one Argument to reconcile him to it, and show him how much it is wanted with us, it might free his new Correspondent Mr. Fife from the strange Absurdity of making such an unnatural Conjunction, as he does of the Church and the Conventicle: For I am credibly informed, that, in his catechetical Exercises, he asks two Questions from the Westminister Rhapsody, for one he aoes from the Liturgy.* As to this, Mr. Fife declares, That, in catechising, he does not use the Westminister Catechism, nor no other but the Church Catechism. And the Manner he useth it, in catechising the Youth under his Care, (which he does every Sunday after Evening-worship), is, after their answering distinctly to the Form of the Church-Catechism, he explains every Particular in the Answer, and shows what Influence it ought to have upon their Life and Conversation.

“ Mr. Fife earnestly prays, that God may forgive all his Adversaries, for all they have done and said against him; and earnestly begs Heaven to deliver him *from lying Lips, and from a deceitful Tongue.*”

Besides the Remarks we have already made from this anonymous Phamphlet, there are some other Things we cannot help noticing. And, first, This latent Author asserts, That the *only Change* they [the Usage-Divines] *ever made in the publick Worship, or intended to make, was the using the Scots Communion-office in place of the English.* As to which, we heartily wish this could have been always justly said, and that it could now be truly said. It is a just Observation, That *Men naturally govern themselves more by the Example than by the Precept of others;* and also, That *when Men profess one Thing and act another, their Actions are surely as little to be regarded as their Professions.* What these Gentlemen intend, is only known to themselves; but their constant daily Practices are publicly known to be widely different from, if not inconsistent with, either *English* or *Scots* Liturgy: Nay, we think it is most evident, from their own Writings, that neither the one nor the other will please them.

We shall leave it to discerning Persons to judge, whether there is not a strong Resemblance of an Intention for some other than either *English* or *Scots* Office, from what follows, *viz.* Mr. Dunbar, the senior Bishop, wrote a Letter, dated at Peterhead, August 1743, and directed to his Brethren the other Bishops; in which Letter, af-

ter giving his Advice with regard to the Synod they were then about to hold, he says, "I know not if it will be convenient at this Time, to injoin the Use of the Scots Communion-office, though it ought to be recommended. One more primitive and excellent, which cost Dr. Rattray much Labour, and which he has left in a very fair Manuscript, may one Day be published, and received with universal Approbation." This Letter of Bp Dunbar's is recorded in the Minutes of their Synod; and they returned a Letter of Thanks to him, which is also recorded. And this more primitive and excellent Office is just now published; but whether these Gentlemen are to practise it, themselves best know.

Secondly, Another Thing we cannot pass in Silence, is, We know our Adversaries have all along endeavoured to make those at a Distance believe, that the greatest and best Part of our Congregation followed Mr. Robertson when he deserted us. And indeed little less is plainly insinuated by this hidden Author. As to which, (*Comparisons being odious*), we shall only acquaint our Reader, That, of a Congregation of between four and five hundred, only about thirty communicable Persons (we shall allow their Number, all Ages and Denominations included, to be fifty) left it, and followed Mr. Robertson; And that, of twelve Gentlemen who had the principal Management in all the different Transactions of that Affair, *viz.* five chosen the 11th June 1742, and seven chosen the 11th June 1743; we say, of all these twelve Managers, Mr. Thomas Blair, Signer of the foregoing Letter, is the only one who left the Congregation, and followed Mr. Robertson.

Thirdly, and lastly, We cannot help taking notice of the seeming Inconsistency of the *Usage-writers*, in showing so great Displeasure and Discontent at the Communion and Worship of the Church of England, while at the same Time they, justly, extol it.

The Author or Authors of this anonymous Pamphlet, p. 83. say, "We admire the Orthodoxy and Comprehensiveness of the Matter, and the truly Liturgick Gravity of the Expression in the English Prayer-book: And, upon these Accounts, we revere the Memories of the several Compilers of it." And,

Pag. 84. "It had been well indeed,—if the Liturgy of the Church of England had continued, from the very first Dawn of the Reformation among us, (when it certainly obtained), to be the settled Worship of our Church." And, again,

Pag. 100. "For himself he declares, That he values and esteems the English Liturgy very highly; and that, taken all together, he reckons it one of the fullest and best Forms of publick Worship that any Church has been blessed with."

Now, after such Encomiums upon the Church of England and her Liturgy, is it not very strange, and does it not appear very inconsistent,

consent, that the *Usage-Divines* should (for the sake of introducing into the publick Worship of the Church these antiquated and non-essential *Usages*) show so great Displeasure and Discontent at the Communion and Worship of that Church? should, (contrary to all Law and Order), at their own Will and Pleasure, alter and maim that excellent Form of Worship? and should, by these their Doings, render themselves the fatal Instruments of so miserably disturbing the Peace of the Church, and of publick Society; of destroying the *Uniformity of Worship*, breaking the *Unity of Spirit*, and dissolving the *Bond of Peace*!

It is most certain, as Bp Rankin observes, *That they of the Episcopal Communion in Scotland, both Clergy and Laity, did enjoy profound Peace and Tranquillity amongst themselves, with respect to religious Matters, until some Persons, by a most unwarrantable Zeal, did propagate these divisive Doctrines and Practices concerning the Usages.* During that profound Peace and Tranquillity, we enjoyed the Communion and Worship of the Church of *England* only. And we humbly think, the most probable Way for restoring us again to that blessed State, is, for all of us to return and firmly adhere to that Communion and Worship. It is natural to think, and much to be wished, that, as we of this Island are governed by one Sovereign, and the same Laws, we should have one Religion and the same Liturgy: For it is certain, that nothing conduceth more to the Prosperity, Peace, and Happiness of a Nation, the Peace of the Church, the Honour of Religion, and the Propagation thereof, than an universal Agreement in the publick Worship of almighty God.

The late learned Dr. Brett (who, we believe, knew as much of Antiquity, and of the Religion of the holy Scriptures, as any of the *Usage* Bishops and Clergy) was, 'tis true, for some time engaged in defending and promoting these woful *Usages*; but he was at last convinced of his Mistake, and so well satisfied with the Liturgy of the Church of *England*, that, for many Years before his Death, he officiated by it exactly according to the Rubricks. Would to God the present Bishops and Clergy who are now engaged as he once was, would be persuaded to imitate so laudable an Example, and thereby render themselves the happy Instruments of healing the woful Divisions, and of bringing about that blessed Time, when all in this Island of the Episcopal Communion, *may, with one Mind and one Mouth, glorify our heavenly Father.*

" O almighty God, who has built thy Church upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the head Corner-stone, grant us so to be joined together in Unity of Spirit by their *Doctrine*, that we may be made an holy Temple, acceptable unto thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord.
" Amen."

P O S T S C R I P T.

Though we know that Mr. *Dundas* is to give a Reply to what is contained in this anonymous Pamphlet from p. 11. to p. 51. yet, as we well know most of the Transactions therein mentioned, we think ourselves, in Duty, bound to say something in defence of what we know to be Truth.

As to this Pamphlet in general, we cannot help saying, it would appear, that the Author, at writing it, has been in very bad Humour, and too much governed by a Spirit of Party-heat, Rage and Resentment: For indeed, therein, the Characters of some others, as well as that of Mr. *Dundas*, are attacked after a very strange and rough Manner.

A learned Divine says, " If we would convince or persuade Men in any other Thing, we are never wont to think it a proper Expedient, to use them ill, and give them hard Words. And is rough Usage proper only for the Propagation of the Doctrines of the Gospel, and of a Religion of Peace, of Meekness and Charity ? "

Now as to our particular Remarks. And, first, the Author, p. 17. says, *These were all the regular Settlements, by any ordinary Rules, in the Episcopal Congregation at Dundee, before that of Mr. Raitt in 1727.* By which he would have his Reader to understand, that our late worthy Bishop and Pastor's [Bp *Ouchterlonie*] Settlement was irregular.

The worthy Bishop of *Edinburgh*, in his Letter to Mr. *Falconar*, set down p. 15. 16. of this anonymous Pamphlet, says, *Sure I am, he [Mr. *Goldman*] has the same Right the primitive Presbyters had, the Order of his Superior, with the Consent of the People.* Now, if Mr. *Ouchterlonie* had the Order of his Superior, with the Consent of the People, then surely his Settlement was regular. And that he indeed had these, we shall evidently demonstrate.

Bp *Norie* well knew how the *Usage* party were, at that Time, spreading their divisive Doctrines and Practices. As he himself was of truly stanch and orthodox Principles, and a most faithful vigilant Pastor, the Love he bore to his Flock, made him use his best Endeavour to provide for their spiritual Wants during his declining Life, and also immediately after his Death: And therefore, as he knew Mr. *Ouchterlonie* to be a Man of Piety and Prudence, orthodox in his Principles, and of blameless Life, he proposed him as a fit Pastor for the Congregation, and proper Colleague for Mr. *Goldman*.

That Bp *Norie* was a true Son of the Church, and a most vigilant and deserving Pastor, the following Letter from Bp *Fullarton*, then Bishop of *Edinburgh*, is an evident Proof.

Reverend SIR,

This is to let you know, that I have a deep Sense of the good Appearance you have made on several Occasions for the Church, and the seasonable and successful Opposition you have made to such of our Brethren (*if we may call them so*) who have appeared very forward for such Practices as do naturally tend to divide and destroy our Church; together with the Care you have taken of propagating the *Formula* in your Neighbourhood. Our Church would be happy if she had many such worthy Sons, to support her in her present mournful Situation. And that our blessed Lord may reward the good Service you have done, and are still doing in his Vineyard, and preserve you long among us, is the earnest Prayer of him who, with great Respect, am,

Reverend Brother,

Edin. May 1.

1723

Your very affectionate Brother

and most humble Servant,

(Signed) Jo. B. of Edin.

The Letter is directed thus: *To the Reverend Mr. Robert Norie, Minister of the Gospel at Dundee.*

The above we copied from the original holograph Letter in our Custody.

Now, it is very certain, that it was the Knowledge he had of the Doctrines and Practices of the *Usage-men*, the Care he had of the Church in general, and of his Congregation in particular, made Bp *Norie* take care to get a Man of true Principles settled as his Helper and Successor in the Meeting-house. And, though he proposed Mr. *Ouchterlonie* as a fit Person, yet he would not take upon him to make any Step towards his Settlement, till he knew whether or not he was agreeable to the Congregation. Wherefore, about three Months before his Death, he (being then confined to his House) called the Heads of Families to his Room, in different Parcels, successively, to know their Inclinations towards Mr. *Ouchterlonie*, whom he proposed to them as his Successor in the Meeting-house. Of those who thus attended him in his Room, being one hundred and one Persons, they all signified their being well pleased with his Choice of Mr. *Ouchterlonie*, except eight, *viz.* five who *dis*sented, and three *Non-liquets*; as appears by the following List wrote by Mr. *Ouchterlonie*, who was with Bp *Norie* every Day, at that Time, and had the Particulars from his own Mouth.

*List of the Heads of Families retaining to the Episkopal Meeting-house
of Dundee, who were called by Bp Norie, in order to know their In-
clinations about settling Mr. John Ouchterlonie, as one of the Mi-
nisters of said Congregation.*

<i>David Brisbane of Bullion</i>	<i>* Dr. George Raitt</i>
<i>Thomas Nairne of Baldowan</i>	<i>David Raitt Brewer</i>
<i>Thomas Kydd Merchant</i>	<i>John Brown Brewer</i>
<i>The Reverend Mr. James Paton Presbyter</i>	<i>Andrew Todd Merchant</i>
<i>Dr. David Fotheringham</i>	<i>Charles White Merchant</i>
<i>Mr. John Fotheringham</i>	<i>James Graham of Duntrune</i>
<i>* John Brown Shipmaster</i>	<i>Henry Ogilvy of Templehall</i>
<i>Dr. Alexander Arbuthnot</i>	<i>John Graham Merchant</i>
<i>+ James Lyon Merchant</i>	<i>James Cook Dyer</i>
<i>Thomas Davidson Merchant</i>	<i>Alexander Ouchterlonie Merchant</i>
<i>Alexander Gall Merchant</i>	<i>David Fife Merchant</i>
<i>Dr. John Blair of Balmyle</i>	<i>Thomas Henderson Merchant</i>
<i>John Guthrie of Westhall</i>	<i>James Johnstone Writer</i>
<i>Gilbert Coupar Vintner</i>	<i>James Speed Merchant</i>
<i>James Grahame of Methie</i>	<i>John Forrester of Milhill</i>
<i>Mr. John Hill, late one of the Do- ctors of the Grammar-school, and present Precentor in the Meeting-house</i>	<i>David Ramsay of Gaigy</i>
<i>+ Dr. John Wedderburn</i>	<i>* George Dempster Merchant</i>
<i>* Thomas Wilson Merchant</i>	<i>James Smith Merchant</i>
<i>Patrick Christie Wigmaker</i>	<i>Patrick Balnaves Merchant</i>
<i>Andrew Morison Merchant</i>	<i>Thomas Guthrie Surgeon</i>
<i>John Morison Merchant</i>	<i>Daniel Crockat Merchant</i>
<i>James Rattray Brewer</i>	<i>Alexander Mulloch Taylor</i>
<i>Andrew Laird Merchant</i>	<i>James Ramsay Merchant</i>
<i>William Walker Wigmaker</i>	<i>Gilbert Auchinleck of that Ilk</i>
<i>John Crockat Merchant</i>	<i>James Laird Merchant</i>
<i>Thomas Gentleman Vintner</i>	<i>Frederick Corsar Merchant</i>
<i>Thomas Abercrombie Merchant</i>	<i>Thomas Crichton Surgeon</i>
<i>William Guthrie of Clepington</i>	<i>David Crichton Surgeon</i>
<i>Thomas Watson of Grangebarry</i>	<i>Sir Alexander Watson of Wallace- Craigy</i>
<i>George Burnet Wigmaker</i>	<i>William Donaldson Merchant</i>
<i>John Martin Brewer</i>	<i>Robert Ramsay Merchant</i>
<i>John Strachan Merchant</i>	<i>Robert Guthrie Merchant</i>
<i>John Mann Merchant</i>	<i>James Young Surgeon</i>
<i>Robert Mann Merchant</i>	<i>Robert Fotheringham of Ban- daine</i>
<i>George Ramsay Merchant</i>	<i>James Young Merchant</i>
<i>Walter Graham Merchant</i>	<i>Robert Davidson of Balgay</i>
	<i>+ Alexander Reid of Turfbig</i>
	<i>Robert Graham of Fintry</i>

John

John Claybills of Innergouray
 David Graham Merchant
 Alexander Duncan of Ar-
 drwae
 David Auchinleck Merchant
 James Duncan Merchant
 David Mackenzie Gunsmith
 Robert Souter Taylor
 John Carnegie Stabler
 John Will Taylor
 Thomas Reid Candlemaker
 William Murray Taylor
 William Miller Apothecary
 James Jack Taylor

Andrew Cairns Wright
 Andrew Gray Brewer
 George Fullarton
 William Morris Weaver
 Alexander Crichton Gardener
 Alexander Thomson Taylor
 John Constable Butcher
 Alexander White Shoemaker
 James Robertson Weaver
 Robert Souter
 David Mattie Dyer
 Robert Maal Taylor
 John Marver Dyer
 John Ker Baker

N. B. Those who dissented, or were against calling Mr. Ouchterlonie, are marked thus * ; and the Non-liquets thus †, before their Names.

We have copied the List exactly, and sincerely believe it a true one. More or fewer of us were Eye and Ear Witnesses to all the different Parcels brought into Bp Norie's Room. So that we behoved to know who assented or dissented, and who were Non-liquets.

Now, as Bp Norie found so great a Majority (no less than ninety four to seven, for one of the Non-liquets immediately assented) consenting to Mr. Ouchterlonie; he therefore settled him in the Meeting-house as his Helper and Successor, and as Mr. Goldman's Colleague, as appears by his Deed, set down p. 30. 31. of the above anonymous Pamphlet, the Original of which is in our Custody. In this Deed, Bp Norie tells, that the Generality of the People were apprised of his Intentions, and signified to him, that they were well pleased to receive him [Mr. Ouchterlonie] as one of their Ministers. And accordingly he impowers and authorises him to be so.

Wherefore we may say of this Settlement of Mr. Ouchterlonie's, as the worthy Bp Ross says of Mr. Goldman's, in his above named Letter, That, *sure we are*, Mr. Ouchterlonie had the same Right the primitive Presbyters had, the Order of his Superior, with the Consent of the People. And therefore we humbly think, that any Person who, in Bp Ouchterlonie's Time, intruded into the Congregation, in opposition to him, or carried off any Part of it, invaded his undoubted Right.

Pag. 23. of this anonymous Pamphlet, it is said, "Accordingly, when it was found how much Mr. Norie was fretted at not coming into his Proposal, or even requesting the shortest Time, as next Day, to consider of it, they came indeed generally to give such a Consent as Silence can be interpreted for in such a Case."

As to Bp. Norie's being fretted, we declare, that, so far as we could see, (and, as we were Witnesses to these Transactions, may be allowed as good Judges as this Author), nothing like it appeared about him. Indeed he had too just a Notion of Christian Liberty, to pretend to put the least Restraint upon any Man in such a Case. And, as to the singular Manner in which they (as is insinuated by this Author) gave their Consent, our Reader will please advert, that Bp. Norie, in his Deed of Settlement, tells, that the Generality of the People — signified to him, that they were well pleased to receive Mr. Ouchterlonie as one of their Ministers. And he had, to our certain Knowledge, most just Reason for saying so: Nay, we know that severals, at different Times, and in name of themselves and others then present, made Speeches to Bp. Norie, declaring how well pleased they were with Mr. Ouchterlonie; and how happy the Congregation in general were, in having so good a Judge to propose a fit Minister to their Choice. And such Speeches we witnessed even from some of those who had a principal Hand in bringing Mr. Raitt to this Place, and who joined him immediately upon his coming! This we, with Regret, are obliged to mention, in order to do Justice to the Memories of those two worthy Prelates.

Again, in the same Paragraph, it is said, " For, notwithstanding all the Art that was used, in picking and grabbling the Companies that were brought in." Here again this Author attacks the Character of that worthy Prelate, who was certainly too good a Christian, and too honest a Man in every respect, to be accessory to any low and base Art of picking and grabbling the Companies. The Way Bp. Norie used was fair, open and regular. He began at the utmost Limits of a Street; went regularly through it, and so through the rest of the Streets, inviting all without Distinction, and as many at a Time as his Room would conveniently hold: And accordingly the List is ranged in the same Order as they were called.

As to the Gentleman's Declaration, in the same Paragraph, *That he was one of ten that were called at a Time, six of whom declared, &c.*; this is indeed most astonishing. All we shall say concerning it is, We are morally certain, that, of the hundred and one Persons brought in to Bp. Norie's Room, only five dissented from the calling of Mr. Ouchterlonie; and we are as certain that these five were not all in the Room at a Time.

Here we cannot help noticing, how this Author exposes himself, in reflecting upon Bp. Norie's Character. Does he not say, p. 22. *I do not intend to reflect upon Mr. Norie's Character, or impeach his Memory at all?* But how does he keep by this Promise and Intention, when, in the same Paragraph, he accuses the good Bishop of unfair Dealing? And, in the two succeeding Paragraphs, how does he

he attack the Bishop's Character ? In short, we leave it to any discerning Reader, to judge, if this Author is not here quite inconsistent with himself.

Notwithstanding this regular and canonical Settlement in favours of Mr. Ouchterlonie, and notwithstanding all the Congregation, Dissenters as well as others, had attended his Ministrations, as their settled Minister, and Mr. Goldman's Colleague, for at least twelve Weeks ; yet a Part of the Congregation went to work in order to overturn the Settlement altogether. For which Purpose, they have a Meeting the 2d of February ; at which were present, according to their List, p. 23. 24. sixty one Persons, of which Number there are fourteen or fifteen who were not present in Bp Norie's Room, when the Heads of Families were called thither.

As Mr. Ouchterlonie's Settlement was so canonical ; as it was approved and ratified by all the Bishops in the Nation, except Bp Fullarton ; as the Design of this Meeting was to overturn it ; and as the Bulk of the Congregation were entirely against the Proceedings of this Meeting : for these Reasons we might justly pass by it, without taking any Notice of it. But, as there are some Mistakes in their List, we shall say something of it.

Our Reader will observe, by comparing the Lists, that fifty four who gave their Consent, in Bp Norie's Room, to Mr. Ouchterlonie's Settlement, were not present at this Meeting ; and indeed no wonder they discountenanced such a Meeting. Again, fifteen or sixteen who were present, went thither, not knowing any thing of their Designs ; which so soon as they understood, several of them left the Meeting before the Vote was stated, though they are mentioned in the List as Voters for the Vacancy. There is another Mistake in their List, *viz.* Mr. John Hill, to whom they give the Title of Merchant, is there set down as one who concurred in their Call to Mr. Raitt, and as a Retainer to him as his Minister. Mr. Hill, as is told by this Author, voted against Bp Norie's Place, as Pastor to the Congregation, being vacant. He was then (as he had been for many Years) Precentor to the Congregation, and continued so with Bp Ouchterlonie and Mr. Goldman, for at least two Years after. By comparing the Lists, our Reader will also observe, that, of the ninety three Persons who consented to Mr. Ouchterlonie's Settlement, there were present at this Meeting twenty four, who concurred in that Call to Mr. Raitt, and joined him immediately upon his coming to this Place. What were their Motives for such a Conduct, themselves best know. As to their second List, p. 26. all of low Rank, (most of them being Cottagers), except one or two, it is well known what Means were used to gain them. Were we to mention what we know concerning the Methods then used, by Threatenings, Promises, &c. to Merchants, Tradesmen, and others, in order to divide

and break our Congregation, to make up Mr. Raitt's, it would make a strange Figure in Print.

Here we must suggest to our Reader the Behaviour of our late good Pastor Mr. Goldman, who had been Colleague to Mr. Norie above twenty two Years, and whose Conduct in this Affair, we think, ought to have a considerable Weight, as he was perfectly well acquainted with all the different Transactions, and must be allowed a competent Judge in such Matters. It is very observable, that he would give no Manner of Countenance to the above named Meeting; no, nor to any of their Proceedings in behalf of Mr. Raitt; he was too well satisfied of the Regularity of Mr. Ouchterlonie's Settlement, to give into any such Measures: And accordingly Bp Ouchterlonie and he lived, many Years after, Colleagues.

Again, The Rev. Mr. James Paton, who had been a great many Years Pastor to a Country-charge, and who was then a Member of the Congregation, he too gave an equal Proof as to his Opinion of the Canonicalness of Mr. Ouchterlonie's Settlement, and continued a worthy Member of Bp Ouchterlonie's Congregation till the Day of his Death.

And now let us inquire into Mr. Raitt's Warrant for coming into this Place, and setting up a separate Meeting-house, in opposition to Bp Ouchterlonie and Mr. Goldman, the regular and canonical Pastors of the Congregation. His Warrant for so doing is a Letter from Bp Fullarton. How far it was competent for Bp Fullarton to give such a Warrant, even though there had been a Vacancy in the Meeting-house, (as certainly there was none at that Time), we shall not inquire; but we must take leave to say, that the Information upon which this Warrant proceeded, was very unfair and unjust.

Here we must acquaint our Reader, that the Person who carried the Information to Bp Fullarton, was not belonging to the Episcopal Congregation in Dundee. 'Tis true, the Party for Mr. Raitt had, before that, sent one of the five *Dissenters* to address the Bishops at Edinburgh in favours of Mr. Raitt; (Bp Miller mentions him in his Letter to Bp Ouchterlonie of the 17th February 1727, an Extract of which is set down p. 52. of the *Impartial Enquiry*): But this Messenger returned without any Success; for all those Bishops, *viz.* Miller, Cant, Freebairn, and Ross, unanimously approved of the regular and canonical Settlement of Mr. Ouchterlonie, and condemned the Proceedings in behalf of Mr. Raitt. Thus the Party failing in their first Design, they dispatched Mr. Carnegy to Bp Fullarton.

Bp Fullarton, in his Letter to Bp Duncan, set down p. 49. of the *Impartial Enquiry*, says, " Mr. Carnegy came to me, furnished with " Credentials, and represented the Matter of Fact quite otherwise " than you did to me, making the Number that was for Mr. Raitt's " Side to be thrice as many as were on Mr. Ouchterlonie's Side. " This

" This is a Matter of Fact that was very well attested, and helped
 " very much to determine me in Mr. Raith's favours." The ori-
 ginal Letter, from which Mr. Dundas took the above Extract, is in
 our Custody.

Now, it is most evident, from this Letter, that the Information Bp Fullarton had from Mr. Carnegy determined him to act the Part he did. And we declare, that the Information making the Numbers of the Congregation on Mr. Raith's Side to be *thrice as many* as were on Mr. Ouchterlonie's Side, was altogether contrary to Truth. The foregoing authentick List is an evident Proof of this. But further, we affirm, that, at *Easter 1727*, which was above four Weeks after this Information was given, and two or three Weeks after Mr. Raith had set up his Meeting-house here; we say, we affirm, that, at *Easter 1727*, at least four fifth Parts of the Congregation adhered to Bp Ouchterlonie and Mr. Goldman.

Now, if the Warrant for Mr. Raith's Settlement was founded upon an Information altogether contrary to Truth, what must the Settlement itself be? If the Foundation was unsound, what must the Superstructure be?

It is well known, that, very soon after the Death of that most worthy Prelate, Bp Ross of Edinburgh, which happened *March 1720*, the *Usage-men* grew much more open in propagating their *Tenets*; which obliged the College of Bishops to emit the *Formula*, in order to suppress all Innovations in the Worship: And it is very certain, that Bp Fullarton was as forward in promoting this *Formula* against the *Usages*, as any of the rest of the Bishops; this plainly appears from the above Letter of his to Mr. Noxie. Now, after this, can it be supposed, that Bp Fullarton would have acted a Part so inconsistent with his former Deeds and Profession, had he not been imposed upon? Had he been rightly informed of the canonical Settlement of Mr. Ouchterlonie; had he been informed that Mr. Raith was a real Encourager and Promoter of the *Usages*, and that he had refused to subscribe the *Formula*; we say, had these been fairly represented to him, is it to be imagined he would have acted such a Part?

Wherefore we think Mr. Dundas in the right, when he says, in his *Impartial Enquiry*, That *Bp Fullarton was imposed upon by false Informations*.

Pag. 12. of the anonymous Pamphlet, it is said, " And whereas
 " he, [Mr. Dundas], like his Author Boece, adduces Vouchers, whose
 " being authentick depends too much upon his single Credit and Te-
 " stimony, the Originals of some of which, if ever he saw himself,
 " I never could find any one else that did." Again, *p. 27.* it is
 said, " I need not tell him, how easy it is to make up Lists, and
 " that he might even have added a Cypher to his Number, if he
 " had

"had pleased." But we need not quote particular Pages for Instances of this Author's Spleen; for indeed a good deal of this Part of his Pamphlet seems to have been calculated purposely to make the World believe, that Mr. *Dundass* founded the Appendix to his *Impartial Enquiry* upon Lies and Falshoods; and therefore he endeavours to build his own and his Party's Reputation upon the Ruins of Mr. *Dundass*'s.

As to Mr. *Dundass*'s List of 101 Persons, we hope our Reader will allow, that we have already sufficiently accounted for that. And as for the Vouchers referred to by Mr. *Dundass*, we shall now account for them. But first we must acquaint our Reader, that all Bp *Ouchterlonie*'s Papers, relating to Church-affairs, are in our Custody; amongst which are, besides these Vouchers, several other authentick Documents, concerning the Practices of some Men.

We shall go on with the Vouchers, as they are mentioned by Mr. *Dundass*. And, first,

1. Pag. 44. of his *Impartial Enquiry*, he gives a Copy of the *Formula*, with a Letter from the College of Bishops to Mr. *Norie*; the Originals of which are in Mr. *Dundass*'s Custody. But the Original (written by Bp *Fullarton*) of the following Letter, from the College of Bishops to Mr. *Norie*, is in our Custody.

Reverend Brother,

THE College of Bishops here have agreed upon a circular Letter, which they intend to cause disperse through the Clergy and Laity of our Communion in this Kingdom, to let them understand the Sense we have of the antiquated Usages, which some are endeavouring to introduce into the Worship of this Church by their own incompetent Authority. And we think you a proper Person to disperse the foresaid Letter in the Presbytery of *Meigle* and *Dundee*, which we intreat you to do as you would oblige, &c.

(Signed) *Jo. B. of Edin.*

ARTH. MILLER Bp.

AND. CANT Bp.

DAVID FREEBAIRN Bp.

Edin. 8th March

1723.

P. S. With the circular Letter, we have inclosed a Copy of the *Formula*, subscribed by the Ministers in and about *Edinburgh* to the Number of forty and three, and we hope that our Brethren within your District, who have the Peace and Unity of the Church at heart, will not refuse to do the like.

2. *Ibid. p. 45.* Mr. *Dundass*, in order to prove, that Bp *Fullar-*
ton

ton was, by the College of Bishops, restricted to the Superintendency of the District of Edinburgh *allenarly*, quotes several Passages from a Letter from Bp *Freebairn* to Bp *Ouchterlonie*, dated 18th March 1727; which original Letter is in our Custody.

3. For a further Proof that Bp *Fullarton* was restricted as above, Mr. *Dundas*, p. 45. 46. inserts an Extract of a Letter of Bp *Irvin's* to Bp *Norie*, dated 9th October 1724; which original Letter is also in our Custody.

4. Mr. *Dundas*, p. 46. gives a Copy of the College of Bishops their Declaration against any particular Bishop's Power without his own District; which original Declaration is likewise in our Custody.

5. Mr. *Dundas*, p. 47. inserts a Copy of the College of Bishops their Letter to Mr. *Raitt*, desiring him to *retire to the Congregation from whence he came, so as not to keep up a Schism in Dundee*. And p. 48. he inserts a Copy of a Letter from Bp *Duncan* to Mr. *Raitt* on the same Subject. We know the Originals of both these Letters were sent open to Bp *Ouchterlonie*, and that he caused the *Sexton* deliver them to Mr. *Raitt*, after taking Copies of them; which Copies, wrote by Bp *Ouchterlonie*, are in our Custody.

6. Mr. *Dundas*, p. 49. gives an Extract of Bp *Fullarton's* Letter to Bp *Duncan*. We have already mentioned that the Original of this Letter is in our Custody.

7. Mr. *Dundas*, p. 49. &c. gives some Extracts from a long Letter which the other Bishops wrote to Bp *Fullarton*. As to this Letter, we must put our Reader in mind, that, in the Letter (set down p. 47. 48. of the *Impartial Enquiry*) which the College of Bishops wrote Mr. *Raitt* desiring him to retire from *Dundee*, they tell him, that they had wrote to Bp *Fullarton*, *justly complaining of his Usurpation upon the Rights of the Episcopal College, as in other Things, so particularly in that Matter, which he can never justify*. Of this their Letter to Bp *Fullarton*, they sent a Copy to Bp *Ouchterlonie*; which Copy, dated at *Edinburgh April 1727*, is in our Custody; and, as it contains so full and distinct an Account of that Affair, we shall here give an exact Double of it.

Right Reverend and dear Sir,

WE are heartily sorry to be informed, that you are at present in a bad State of Health; and pray God may restore you, and of his Goodness prepare you and all of us for our appointed Change, by making us so to acquit ourselves in that high Station to which he hath raised us in his Church, that we may neither be ashamed to live, nor afraid to die.

The present Circumstances of this poor persecuted Church are such as occasions Lamentation to all serious Men, and brings us under

der an absolute Necessity of calling a Meeting of the College of Bishops, which, in your necessary Absence, we find ourselves obliged to do, to stop the Mouths of our Adversaries, and to satisfy our Friends who too justly complain, that the Bishops, by their Delay and Indolence, are suffering the Affairs of the Church to run into utter Confusion; for which we expect your Thanks.

It adds to our Affliction not a little, that, in your present Situation, many People take the Freedom to impose upon you a great many Falshoods, knowing too well, that, at such a Distance from this Place, you have not the Opportunity of inquiring into the Truth of what they advance; and by which you have of late been induced to do some Things which, upon better Information, you will not justify; and for which we are heartily sorry, seeing they give all thinking Men, who have the Peace of the Church at heart, occasion to admire your Management, and to regret the Confusions and Animosities that are occasioned by it.

You cannot but remember, how zealous you and all of us were to prevent that woful Schism which is occasioned by the strenuous Advanced of the *Usages*; and that, in order thereto, we drew up a *Formula*, to be subscribed by all the Presbyters in this National Church, and sent circular Letters requiring them to give ready Compliance how soon the same was offered to them; not doubting but this would have prevented the Confusions which threatened this poor persecuted Church by *Innovations*. Notwithstanding whereof, we, to our great Surprise, find you have made such Steps, since you left this Place, as plainly contradict and overturn what you seemed so forward for: As particularly, in the Case of a Settlement made by Bp *Norie* in favours of Mr. *Ouchterlonie*, who is now one of our Order; which Settlement was laid before us within a few Days after it was granted; and, finding that it was *most canonical*, we did heartily approve and ratify the same. For, if he who was Bishop of the District, had not Power, with the Consent of the greatest and better Part of the Congregation, to instal a Minister in that Place, or any other within his Jurisdiction, we do not know what his Superintendency of that District was good for. And this you seem abundantly convinced of yourself: For, by your Letter to Bp *Duncan*, you do in the strongest Terms declare, That, if his Letter had not come to you too late, you had been so persuaded by the convincing and self-evident Reasons it contained, that no Man should have ever been able to have made you attempt to overturn the Settlement which worthy Bp *Norie* had made: But that one Mr. *Carnegy*, who was sent to you from the Shire of *Angus*, and brought with him Credentials, had represented that Affair quite otherwise than Bp *Duncan* had done; assuring you, that the Number

ber

bers for Mr. Raitt were three Times as many as were for Mr. Ouchterlonie, which helped to determine you in Mr. Raitt's favours.

That you may know how scandalously you have been imposed upon by that Representation, we have herewith sent you a List of those who consented to Mr. Ouchterlonie's Settlement, and subjoined thereto the Persons that dissented therefrom; who, you'll see, were only five, and two more who took it to advise, one of which afterwards also consented.

By virtue of this Settlement, Mr. Ouchterlonie was at least twelve Weeks in possession, and officiated every Lord's Day as Minister of Dundee, with Mr. James Goldman, his Colleague, (who has been Minister in that Place these two and twenty Years bygone), before Mr. Norie's Death; during which Time, the whole Congregation, as well Dissenters as others, did regularly frequent the Worship, without making any Objection against his Title; as indeed they could not, seeing there was so great a Majority for him.

All this is Fact, which we will warrant to be true. Now, that you should have taken upon you, by a Letter, to overturn such a regular Settlement, and pretend to turn a Man out of Possession, without ever inquiring into the Merits of the Cause, is what, although you had been *Metropolitan*, and the Church in a flourishing Estate, you could not have done to the meanest Office-bearer in the Church: For no Man ever was or could be turned out of Possession, however ill-founded, without a Hearing; as you have done in the present Case, and appointed another to officiate where there was no Vacancy; and all this to do Service to a Man who is a *violent Abetter* of the *Usages*, and has all along *schismatically* stood out against the Appointment of the College requiring him to subscribe the *Formula*; and, consequently, of all Men the most unfit to be Minister in such a publick place as *Dundee*; where he would have Opportunity to draw some hundreds of People into the *Schism*, to which heretofore they have shewed such an Aversion.

Wherefore it is our Opinion and earnest Desire, that, to save your own Reputation, as well as for settling the Differences that have chiefly arisen in that Town by the seeming and unwarrantable Authority you have given Mr. Raitt to officiate as Minister in *Dundee*, you would be pleased, upon Receipt hereof, to write a Letter to those Gentlemen who have so scandalously imposed upon you, telling them, you are sensible of the bad Usage you have met with in that Affair; and another to Mr. James Raitt, requiring him to retire to the Charge from whence he came, and give no more Disturbance to Bp Ouchterlonie, and Mr. Goldman his Colleague, to whom the great Body of that Congregation does still retain; there having no less than *three hundred and five* communicated with them

at Easter, even although Mr. Raitt gave the Sacrament the same Day, who had not *sixty* Communicants, and a great many of these no Parishioners of Dundee: And that you would be pleased to send these Letters open to us, that we, by seeing them, may be saved the Trouble of conveening Mr. Raitt before us, and inflicting the Censures of the Church upon him, for his irregular *Intrusion* upon that Congregation, as well as for his refusing to subscribe the *Formula*; which, if not prevented by his speedy leaving of that Place, we are fully resolved to do.

We are likewise very much surprised to hear, that there is a Design on Foot to promote one Mr. Dunbar, Minister at Cruden, to the Bishoprick of Murray. God forbid you should have any Hand in this Affair, seeing we are well informed he is not only *Bourigno-nist* in his Principles, but also a most strenuous Promoter of the *Usages*: And, if he shall be advanced to the Episcopate, it will give the finishing Stroke to this sinking Church, and make the World believe, that all the Endeavours that were used to prevent it, by pressing the *Formula*, was nothing but Juggle and Double-dealing; or that we have changed our Opinions, which, by God's Help, we never will.

We have endeavoured all alongst to keep good Terms with you, and have sat down with many Things for Peace sake. But, when we find that you continue to act in the highest Concerns of the Church, without the Knowledge and Consent of your Brethren, we are obliged, in vindication of ourselves before God and the World, to signify our Resentment, and to assure you, that we will sit no longer with such *Usurpations* upon the College. For though you are our *Preses*, when you can be present; yet you are but a single Member of it, and have no more Power than any of us. For the *Metropolitical* Power, to which you pretend, can have no Foundation; seeing you have disclaimed it under your own Hand, not only at your Election to be Bishop of Edinburgh *allenarly*, but by your missive Letter; both which are in our Hands, and must needs demonstrate (if propaled) how much you have been in the wrong to assume Powers you were never invested with, not only over the College of Bishops, but over the whole Church. For, by your constant favouring and encouraging the *Usage-party*, you have brought this afflicted Church to the very Brink of Ruin, as in other Instances, so particularly in the pretended Settlement of Mr. Raitt, and approving of Mr. Dunbar to the See of Murray.

Wherefore we beseech you, in the Bowels of *Christ Jesus*, and for the sake of this Church, that you would comply with our earnest Desire above written, and let us once again unite our common Counsels for promoting the Glory of God, the Peace and Quiet of his Church committed to our Charge, and put a Stop to this *woeful*

give

Scism, which threatens to sap her Foundations. We beg you'll give us a particular and categorical Answer by this Bearer, whom we have sent Express, and not put us upon a Necessity of doing Things which may be disobliging to you, as well as disagreeable to ourselves.

We are, with great Respect,

Edinb April 1727. Right Reverend, &c.

Whether Bp Fullarton gave any Return to the above Letter, we know not; but, that it was delivered, we find by a Letter from Bp Duncan to Mr. Gillan, dated at Glasgow the 28th April 1727; which original Letter is in our Custody.

In this Letter, the Bishop, after mentioning Bp Fullarton's Distress, and that he soon expected to hear of his Death, says, " The Bearer we sent Express, returned some Days ago, and brought me nothing back but the Receipt of his Letter. I do believe his [Bp Fullarton's] Friends are taking some Time, what Answer to make. They have promised to send a Return, by Express, to Greenock, and from thence, by Post, to me.

— " I think it very proper that the Bishops write a friendly Letter to Mr. Raitt, advising him to leave his *Intrusion* upon the Congregation at Dundee; and, if such a Letter be sent to me, I will very freely subscribe it."

We have already seen, that the Bishops did write such a Letter to Mr. Raitt, and that Bp Duncan himself also wrote Mr. Raitt a Letter to the same Purpose; Copies of which are inserted p. 47. 48. of the *Impartial Enquiry*.

8. Mr. Dundass, p. 52. gives an Extract of a Letter from Bp Miller to Bp Ouchterlonie, dated at Leith 17th February 1727. In which Letter Bp Miller gives his Opinion, that, as Mr. Raitt was such a Partizan for the Usages, and having refused to sign the Formula, he cannot be admitted to any Congregation until he take it. The original holograph Letter, from which Mr. Dundass took the Extract, is in our Custody. The first Part of which Letter is as follows.

" By the Paper sent to you, signed by Bp Freebairn, Bp Cant and me, you see my Concern for you and the Peace of the Church. It prevented the Address made to me yesterday by a great Number of your Parish and Neighbourhood. I have neither Time nor Strength to enter upon all the Particulars that passed betwixt me and Mr. White Merchant in your Town, that was sent over to manage the Affair; only, I tell you, Mr. William Cockburn was his Agent."

What the Paper he here mentions, signed by him and his two Colleagues, and sent to Bp Ouchterlonie, is, we know not; but the

original

original Letter from Bps *Miller* and *Cant* to Bp *Ouchterlonie*, of which follows a Copy, is in our Custody.

Right Reverend and dear Brother,

AS we are very sensible of the great Loss the Church is at by the Death of our Right Reverend Brother Bp *Robert Norie*; so we bless God for the Choice he did make of you to succeed him in the Town and Parish of *Dundee*, for performing all Ministerial Actions to that worthy and regular People, in conjunction with our Reverend Brother Mr. *James Goldman*: And we doubt not but, by the harmonious and diligent and circumspect Behaviour of you both, and God's Blessing upon your Labours, ye shall be eminent Instruments of doing good Service to God and his Church in that Place: and, in the mean time, ye shall want no Encouragement that may be in the Power of,

Right Reverend and dear Brethren,

Dated Edinburgh and Leith, Your most affectionate Brethren,

11th February 1727. and most humble Servants,

(Sign'd) ARTH. MILLER.
AND. CANT.

Thus, we hope, we have sufficiently accounted for all the *Vouchers* adduced by Mr. *Dundas* in the Appendix to his *Impartial Enquiry*.

And now, after this, we leave it to all thinking Persons, to consider what Credit is to be given to this hidden Author, who is at such Pains to defame Mr. *Dundas*.



A Letter from Mr. Smith to the Reverend Mr. David Fife, dated 19th February 1745, wherein some Remarks are made upon the late anonymous Pamphlet.

Reverend SIR,

I Received your's of 29th *January*, and do assure you, I am not under the least Concern upon my own Account, at the rough Treatment Mr. *Raitt* has been pleased to bestow upon me in such a plentiful Manner. It is my Opinion, he has done himself and his Cause more Harm by it than me. He would gladly make it a national Quarrel; and he and his Party would fain have it believed, that my interposing in your Affairs, tends to overthrow the Independency of your Church. But he has not the least Grounds to raise such a Clamour, I having asserted it as strongly as possible, in my late Letter printed at *Edinburgh*; and done no more than the Duty of every Catholick Bishop in such a Case as this, when the Bishops

Bishops in a Nation have unwarrantably made a Breach in their own, and refuse Communion with their Sister-Church; of which this is a manifest Token, That they clearly enough, in this very Pamphlet, declare, that some Doctrines intrinsick to the holy *Eucharist*, are not so much as implied in her Communion office; and that therefore it is not lawful to communicate with her in the highest Act of religious Worship.

The dear *Implication-scheme*, as Mr. *Raitt* is pleased to call it, is here apparently ridiculed, and is intimated to be contrary to the authentick Deeds of our Church, which he most untruly pretends I have set at open Variance to promote it. I acknowledge, he has acted more like an honest Man than the rest of his Brethren, in not saying, in his Declaration, as they have done in theirs, that he is in full Communion with the Church of *England*. He indeed, as well as they, can, it seems, tolerate the Use of our Office, though they will not communicate when and where it is used. But, whether tolerating an invalid Sacrament, or rather a sacrilegious Mockery instead of a Sacrament, as these Gentlemen must think it, can be so much as palliated, much less justified, I leave to them to consider.

It is very well, that the *Narrative* will soon be ready, and I hope thereby Mr. *Raitt*'s Account of the Case will be thoroughly confuted. I could wish to see it soon, that I may make a proper Use of it in the Answer I am preparing to Mr. *Raitt*'s Pamphlet. I presume Mr. *Dundass* will immediately set about a Reply, and doubt not but he will be able so fully to clear up the Affair, as to satisfy all unprejudiced Persons.

As to my Letters which Mr. *Raitt* has published, I am not at all displeased at the Event, but rather otherwise; because therein are contained, in short, the Reasons why these Gentlemen (notwithstanding the Validity of their Ordination, which all schismatical Bishops have) have no Right to the Obedience of the Clergy and People; as neither being Bishops of your national Church, nor in Communion with ours. And I am so little solicitous about your keeping up my Letters, that you are very welcome to show them to whomsoever you think fit; that Mr. *Raitt*, if he pleases, may print them in his next publick Performance.

Mr. *Raitt*, p. 99. complains, that I did not communicate first to himself any Impressions or Informations I might have received to his Prejudice about your Affair. Now, he has no just Reason to make this Complaint: For, on the 9th of October 1743, I wrote to Mr. *Keith*, in order to be communicated to all his Colleagues, a Letter penned in the most humble and submissive Language, and therein interceded for you in the most suppliant Manner; and proposed, as I imagined, a very proper and easy Method to compose the

the Difference. Soon after Mr. *Keith* had received my Letter, Mr. *Alexander*, at his Desire, went to *Dundee*, and told Mr. *Raitt* what I had advised ; but Mr. *Raitt* would not listen to it, although several of his Friends there, as well as Mr. *Alexander*, endeavoured to persuade him. Is it not plain then, that my Sentiments and Advice, wherein I spoke the Mind of my Colleagues here, as well as my own, were communicated to him ; and, although most civilly and candidly offered, were entirely disregarded ? I therefore had all the Reason in the World to believe it was to no manner of purpose to intercede with him in your behalf, or trouble either him or any body else any farther about it. And, to let you see how little Cause he has to quarrel with my Conduct upon this Account, I will here transcribe that Part of my Letter which principally relates to this melancholy Busnels.

“ It is a great Pity you were not with the rest of your Colleagues “ at the Consult about this unhappy Deposition : For then a Per- “ son of your pacifick Temper, joining with the other two Bishops “ who were against it at first, might have been able to prevail with “ Bp *Raitt* (who, I readily acknowledge, was sufficiently provoked “ to take the severest Course) to set a noble Example of a patient “ and forgiving Disposition, and to despise this personal Affront and “ Injury, especially it being apparent the Peace of the Church is so “ much at stake. I still have Reason to hope, from the excellent “ Character he bears, that, upon a due Consideration of all Cir- “ cumstances, and particularly upon a View of the very bad Con- “ sequences which may ensue, he will be pleased, upon Mr. *Fife*’s “ humble Submission to his Authority, and Promise of a faithful “ Obedience for the future, which you informed me he was ready “ to make, to take off, with the Concurrence of his Colleagues, the “ heavy Censure Mr. *Fife* now lies under, and then permit him to “ officiate in the Congregation he is possessed of, in the same man- “ ner as Bp *Ouchterlonie* used to do formerly. This, I am sure, will “ gain our worthy Colleague the Hearts of many, who now, I fear, “ think hardly of him upon this Account, and will make his “ Name reverenced by all good Men, who will every where speak “ of him with the highest Honour and Respect, for sacrificing his “ own private Resentment to the publick Peace and Tranquillity. “ What I here request in Mr. *Fife*’s behalf, is undoubtedly in the “ Bishop’s Power to grant : And, since a Person of his good Sense “ and eminent Virtue cannot but have an earnest Desire to see Uni- “ ty entirely restored, which will be both a great Comfort to “ himself, and an infinite Blessing to the Flock over which he pre- “ sides ; and which cannot, as far as I can discern, be effected any “ other way ; I am willing to assure myself, he will need little Per- “ suasion to do his Part in making up the Breach. And, if he will “ be

" be so good as grant this Favour at the Intercession of you and
 " his other Colleagues, and upon my humble Application to him,
 " which I hereby make through your Means, I dare say it will be
 " no small Pleasure to you, and it will be sure to meet with my
 " grateful Acknowledgment. That it would be very acceptable
 " to you, I conclude, from your commiserating this unhappy Man's
 " Case, when you discoursed with me about him, and from your
 " saying, that the People could not now in Honour desert him, by
 " accepting Mr. *Raitt's* Proposal of having any other Minister they
 " pleased set over them, and so leaving him destitute of all Support
 " and Maintenance. This is a Thing they cannot, now they have
 " called him, in any Reason comply with; and I question not but
 " by this Time your worthy Colleague is sensible of it. I had not
 " spoke one Word in Mr. *Fife's* behalf, but that you assured me
 " he was, in all other Respects, a Man of an unexceptionable Cha-
 " racter. I hope then, his former Merits, and present good
 " Qualities and Capacities, may in some Degree plead for him.
 " And, considering your Church is not overstocked with Clergy,
 " it would upon that Account be well if he were restored to his
 " Station.

" I thought to have made an End here; but, since I know you
 " expect to have my Thoughts concerning the principal Parts of
 " Bp *Raitt's* Letter, I must beg your Patience a little longer, be-
 " ing willing to make you a full Discovery of my whole Sentiments,
 " as far as I can remember the Contents of it. I speak to you as
 " my Friend, whom I highly esteem, with all imaginable Frank-
 " ness. If therefore I chance to say any Thing cross to your Op-
 " nion, I persuade myself you will take no Offence at it. As I
 " said before, I here again declare, that Mr. *Fife's* Conduct is by
 " no means to be justified; but yet I cannot but conceive his Fault
 " will admit of some Alleviation. I remember Mr. *Raitt* gives an
 " Account, that there were two Congregations at *Dundee*, over one
 " of which Bp *Ouchterlonie* presided, who, I believe, always used
 " the *English* Liturgy. In the Beginning of this Year, Bp *Raitt*,
 " who, I suppose, prefers the *Scots* Liturgy, endeavoured to unite
 " both Congregations; to which Union a Meeting of the chief Per-
 " sons of both Congregations agreed. But, upon second Thoughts,
 " they perceived that the *English* Liturgy would be entirely exclu-
 " ded at *Dundee*; and this, as I take it, was the Ground of the
 " Quarrel. Hereupon many of them applied to the Bishop, and
 " desired they might be in the same State they were in Bp *Ouchter-
 lonie's* Time, and have a Minister who would use the *English* Li-
 " turgy as before. But the Bishop, insisting upon the Union of the
 " Congregations, asked them, Whether they owned him for their
 " Bishop? To which they answered, They were of the Communion
 " of

of the Church of *England*, and rejected his Authority ; suppos-
 ing, I presume, that he rejected the Communion of the Church
 of *England*, by his not complying with their Request for that
 Church's Liturgy, and only officiating by the *Scottish*. Now, in
 Reply to this, he should, I humbly conceive, have told them, he
 did not reject the Communion of the Church of *England*, as ap-
 pears by his approving the Use of the *English* Liturgy in the first
 Article of the late *Concordate*, which he still stands by, and by
 his never refusing to join it in those Congregations where that
 Communion-office was constantly officiated by, although he ra-
 ther chose himself to minister by the *Scottish* Office, as he was war-
 ranted to do by the said first Article of the Agreement. Some-
 thing of this kind said, would have given them to understand,
 that he looked upon both Liturgies to be in Substance and Mean-
 ing the same ; and that he and our Church were of the same
 Communion : And it is not unlikely this would have pacified
 them, or, at least, would have rendered them the more inexcu-
 sable. But I do not remember he says any thing in his Letter,
 from whence one may gather he gave them this Satisfaction.
 And yet I cannot but be of Opinion he was short in this ; and
 he should have taken special Care to obviate and prevent every
 Scruple and Suspicion of theirs upon this Score ; which if he ne-
 glected to do, it was certainly a very great Omission. For what
 Effect could this have, but to induce them to believe, that nei-
 ther he nor his Colleagues, if they were all of one Mind, held
 Communion with us, whom they have hitherto esteemed a sound
 Part of the Catholick Church ; or that he, at least, had con-
 demned our Liturgy, and thereby broke off all fraternal Cor-
 respondence with us ? And what could naturally follow from
 this, but that the People should imagine there was a direct
 Schism commenced between him, and all those, whether of your
 or our Church, who either used or approved the Use of the
English Liturgy ? Thus, as it seems to me, there were great
 Mistakes on both Sides ; on theirs, for supposing he had broke
 Communion with our Church, with whom they were united ;
 and on his, for not openly confuting that Calumny, as I, in
 Charity and Respect to him, believe it to be. It is plain they
 thought their Bishop was not of the same Communion with them,
 i. e. was not in Communion with the Church of *England*. Now,
 though this, I make no question, was a very wrong Judgment in
 them ; yet, since they were unfortunately prepossessed with this
 Notion, as appears from the Bishop's Letter they probably were,
 there is the less Wonder they should act in this disrespectful Man-
 ner. But now, if our dear Brother will, in Christian Meekness,
 so far condescend, as to declare to Mr. *Fife* and his People, his

“ Approbation of the Use of our Liturgy, and that he is very far from intending to reject our Communion by his using the *Scottish*; and will please to receive them into Favour upon their Submission; and, to shew he has no Disesteem for our Church, allow of Mr. *Fife*’s Ministry among them by our Liturgy: this will be the most easy and natural Method to compose the Difference, and set the Minds of all those in your Church at ease, who are now greatly disturbed and uneasy at this rigorous Censure.

“ You and your worthy Colleagues will pardon me, if I, considering the Station wherein the Providence of God has placed me, though very unworthy of it, cannot blame Mr. *Fife* and his Adherents just Esteem for our excellent Liturgy, and Zeal for continuing in our Communion; and therefore, with some Earnestness, interpose in their behalf. And as I shall always be ready to assist you in supporting your Authority, and dissuading People, upon any Pretence of this sort, from making Dissensions in your Church; so I hope you will, in Charity to us, and Compassion to your own Flock, be very careful of giving them the least Occasion for receiving any such ill Impressions of you; and, as an Earnest of this, will vouchsafe to cancel this Deposition; which, as it was too hastily and precipitately issued out, so it cannot be too speedily discharged and annulled.”

And now, let every Man of Sense judge, after reading of this, whether I have been in the least wanting in due Respect to Mr. *Raitt* on this unhappy Occasion, and whether I did not take a very proper Method fairly and frankly to communicate my Thoughts to him. But he was *deaf* to every thing both I and others could say; and, being *buried* away by a *strong Resentment*, and the *Warmth* of his own Temper, and *spirited* up by his Colleague Mr. *White*, still continued resolved to push Matters to Extremity; insomuch that he, in conjunction with the other, was *very angry* even with Mr. *Keith* for not reading your Deprivation publickly in his Chapel, and *took his not going all their Lengths* in this Matter *very much a-miss*. All this I had undoubted Intelligence of, even by the Means of a hearty Friend to these Gentlemen. What Encouragement then had I to make any farther Application to Mr. *Raitt*? And what Room is there for his accusing me of not doing it? If he would not hearken to the earnest Intreaties of his Colleagues there, was it possible for me to expect that any thing I could say would have better Success?

When I wrote the above Letter to Mr. *Keith*, who had taken Pains to give me such Information about your Case, as might put the best Gloss upon the Proceedings of his Colleagues, (which yet did then seem so harsh even to himself, that he could not but declare his Disapprobation of them), and who, you may be sure, did

his utmost to imprint on my Mind the most favourable Opinion of Mr. Raitt; I was very desirous to believe this Gentleman was not a declared Enemy to our Church; and, upon that Supposition, said, your Conduct was not to be justified. But the Share he had in the Transactions of the late *Synod*, and most especially his late Pamphlet, have fully discovered his rooted Aversion to our excellent and Catholick Office: And therefore he cannot, with any Reason, expect we should look upon him as of the same Communion with the Church of *England*; which it seems is not *catholick* enough for him, and from which he has manifestly separated by setting up his Office and Altar *against* her's.

And, upon this Account, I now think myself bound, in the most publick Manner, to profess, that the Conduct of you, and all the worthy Members of your Congregation, who will not suffer yourselves to be compelled to go out from us by the *violent Persecution* of your and our common Adversaries, but are resolved faithfully to continue with us in all Events, is so far from being blame-worthy, that it justly merits the highest Commendation and Applause. Go on then, in the Name of God, to do your Duty, maugre all the Menaces and Rage of your Persecutors, who, being not Members of the true Communion, cannot have the lawful Authority of Bishops in it. And, since their Censures are altogether ineffectual to all spiritual Purposes, your sacerdotal Character is no more hurt or impaired by them, than if *Romish*, *Novatian*, or *Donatist* Bishops, had passed Sentence upon you.

You will observe, in the above written Transcript, several Particulars which passed in Conversation betwixt Mr. Keith and me. Now, he never pretended to deny any of them; but, in his Answer to my Letter, would fain bring himself off, by saying, I mistook his Meaning. For instance, with regard to one of the remarkable Passages, he would excuse the Matter thus: *For my saying the People of Dundee could not now in Honour desert Mr. Fife, I only narrated what I knew these People had declared to two of my Brethren, who had communed with them on that Affair, though indeed I did not acquaint you that I had those Accounts.* I must own I was very much shocked at this; for he spoke those Words as his own Sense of that Matter, and not as the Declaration of others. He did not then qualify his Discourse as he does here in his Letter; and he himself acknowledges as much, confessing *he did not acquaint me with such Accounts of that Affair*, as, if he had, could not but have induced me to take him, not in an absolute, but in a limited Sense. In short, he did not narrate what others said, but spoke, in all Appearance, his own Mind freely. What secret mental Reservation he might have, himself best knows. This gave me no very favourable Impression of my Correspondent's sincere Dealing. But when,

when, about two Months after, the Minutes of the late *Synod* came into my Hands, the Transactions of which he had *carefully concealed* from me, and I there saw that he was as much concerned as any of the rest in agreeing to concur in the Sentence of Deposition, I must confess I was quite astonished; and this I sufficiently discovered in my Letter to Mr. *Mackenzie*. What, thought I, could this Gentleman, who so much declared his Displeasure at the Conduct of his Brethren for passing this Censure, be himself the *Head* of those who decreed it? This was a Contradiction I could by no means reconcile. He is self-condemned, as Mr. *Raitt* very truly observes: And, because I have taken the Freedom to tell him so, he is now become my professed Enemy, and uses all the mean Arts he is Master of to defame me. If Mr. *Raitt* will have it, that his Testimony is good for nothing, because he is self-condemned, I shall by no means say any thing to the contrary; and his informing me, that the Quarrel was about the Liturgy, I agree, shall be accounted of no Significance for the future.

As for his Clamours, that I have acted against the Independency of your Church, they are altogether vain and ridiculous, and a mere *Imposition* upon the common Sense of Mankind. I am as fully satisfied, and upon very good Grounds too, of the Truth of that, as any Man breathing. And therefore, in conjunction with others, who have desired my Assistance in so good a Cause, I have been long endeavouring to maintain and preserve its Canons, and the Laws which establish it, and the Rights and Privileges of all its Members, against the violent Attacks of those who would set them all aside. I am against no other Independency, but that which those Gentlemen so earnestly contend for, who would be *independent* of the established Canons and Laws, and will by no means *submit* to them; although, when they were ordained, they most solemnly vowed, That, by the Help of God, they would give faithful Diligence *always* to minister — the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as *your Church and Realm* hath received the same, according to the Commandments of God; and, when they were consecrated, That the Criminous they would correct and punish, according to such Authority as they have by the Word, and as to them shall be committed by the *Ordinance of your Realm*. Let them but make the Laws of their independent Church and Realm their Rule, in Subordination to the Law of God, in all possible Cases, (for *nemo tenetur ad impossibile*), and this will put an end to all Disputes. But, unless they will vouchsafe to do this, I, though a Stranger, will be found, in the End, a much better Friend to *Scotland*, than those Natives who are obstinately bent on *disobeying* the Laws of it; who, in the Eyes of all honest *Scotsmen*, must appear as open Disturbers of the publick Peace, and cannot be esteemed

true Bishops of that national Church, against which they are in manifest Rebellion.

The national Church of *Scotland* is in Communion with the Church of *England*, and has made her Liturgy, particularly the Communion-office, her own. But these Gentlemen are for throwing out this Office with all possible Speed, as defective in Points essential to the Administration: They therefore will not communicate with the Church of *England* in the highest Solemnity of Christian Worship; consequently cannot belong to the Church of *Scotland*. They are of a Church of a *new Cut*: And therefore all their Acts are null and void, as to spiritual Effect; and their Censures are no more to be regarded, than if they were inflicted by Bishops of the *Papish*, or any other schismatical Communion. You and your People at *Dundee*, whatever else may be pretended, were censured for adhering to the *English* Office, by a Bishop who will not communicate in the Use of it, because, in his Opinion, it does not contain all the Doctrines intrinsick to the divine Ordinance. His Censure therefore was invalid, because he was a Bishop of another Communion, and not of that of the National Church, which is in Communion with the Church of *England*.

If he had indeed been in full Communion with us, he would not surely have failed, somewhere in his Book, to have given us full Satisfaction in the Point. He would not have failed to declare, that our Office wants nothing essential to the Administration of the blessed Sacrament; that it is the same in Substance and true Meaning with that by which himself administers; and that he would never refuse to communicate where it is used in his own Country. Now, nothing of this kind is to be found in his long Performance; but, in several Places, he clearly enough avows the *direct contrary*. People then must be utterly blind, who do not see he is an Enemy to the Church of *England*, and that he persecutes you purely for being in Communion with her.

What a huge Dust, and tragical Outcry, is raised about the Independency of your Church, which no body questions, purely to raise the *Passions* of your Countrymen, and so convey the *Merits* of the Cause quite out of *Sight*? But, I am persuaded, Men of Sense and sound Judgment will not suffer themselves to be *deluded* with *mere Noise*, and will expect, as they have Reason, that these Gentlemen either make a clear and open Profession of the Sufficiency and Perfection of our Office, or ingenuously acknowledge, that they believe the contrary, and are resolved to support and propagate that *Schism* among you, which we have so just Cause to charge them with. If they will not be persuaded to do the former, I must plainly tell them, that even their Silence will be, and deservedly, taken for a Confession of the latter.

As to the *Scottish Office*, I have all along fully declared my Approval of it, and these Gentlemen very well know I do not oppose the Use of it, but only their rash Attempts, who are for perverting, what was framed for *the establishing and keeping Uniformity with the Church of England*, into an Instrument of *Schism*, and who artfully and insidiously make it the *Pretext* to thrust our Office out of the publick Worship, which stands upon as good a Foundation of Authority as the other; though every body is now convinced, the true Reason for their setting it aside, is their *erroneous Belief* of its being defective in *Doctrines essential to the blessed Sacrament*; and therefore altogether unlawful to be used in a Catholick Assembly. There is no one then but must discern, the *Scottish Office* is no Part of the Dispute; but the *schismatical Design* of causing a Division both among your own Members, and between the two Churches, of which it is by them made the unhappy Occasion, is the only Ground of this Contest. And this *divisive Project* is the more apparent, for that they are not *content* with the Office as authorised by the Royal *Martyr's Proclamation*, but they have *depraved* it with several Alterations *squaring better with their wrong Notions and Prejudices*. And this it seems has been done by the Authority of some Bishops, although the said Proclamation ordains, That the publick Form of Service thereby appointed, *shall be uniformly observed* in the Worship of God; and altho' also it is agreed in the *Concordate* subscribed by themselves, that they shall only make use of the *Scottish or English Liturgy*, and that they shall censure any of the Clergy that shall act otherwise. Thus, by their *supereminent Authority*, they have introduced a *new Office*, that can possibly lay no Claim to the Royal Sanction: And this have they done *contrary to their own most solemn Agreement*. So that it is almost impossible to make a *Knot* strong enough to *bind* these Gentlemen. Even their own *Subscriptions*, and other even more *sacred Engagements*, cannot hold them. How then can they expect we can have the least Regard to mere verbal Assurances, or windy Declarations, and those too couched in *vague, general and indefinite Expressions*? No; they must give us some stronger Security than this, or else we can have no Reason to be satisfied.

As to my lamentable Outcries, as he is pleased to stile them, about the Publication of St. *James's Liturgy*, as it is called, (for, after all, it being so much built upon Conjecture, its Genuineness is still very uncertain), I think I have more Reason to make them now than ever. For the Preface says, *It well deserves to be universally received*; which has a great Resemblance of what Mr. *Dunbar* says in his Letter. And moreover, at the Close of the Performance, there is an *Office, to which proper Rubrics are added for Direction*, which is evidently calculated for present Use. And the Author having shewn

shewn this to some worthy Friends, (probably Mr. Keith, who was particularly zealous for its Publication, Mr. Dunbar, Mr. Raitt, &c.), he was advised by them to insert it in the End of the Book. No doubt this was not for nothing. And, since these Gentlemen *will not fail to see how much it is preferable to any of our modern Forms*, it will be difficult to make any one that knows them, believe they will not put it in Practice, notwithstanding their Declaration to the contrary. They may think of this as they please; but, for my Part, so unhappily prejudiced am I, as to conceive, that the two Offices now already in use among you, are as compleat as it, with regard to every thing essential to the divine Ordinance, and therefore every whit as good, and well pleasing to God. Nay, though I fear I shall incur their high Displeasure for it, I will be bold to say, that the *English* Office is, in one respect, much better, as being a better Instrument of Peace in our present Circumstances, and a surer Means of composing the unhappy Divisions now most scandalously rending the Church in Pieces.

What I have farther to say to Mr. Raitt's Piece, I shall reserve for the furnishing out of a full Answer to it; which I hope, with God's Assistance, to finish in a little Time. I shall here only add my most solemn Declaration, That there is no body more earnestly desires to promote the Peace of the Church than I do. But, under the Notion of Peace, I am not for *sacrificing Truth, and introducing Slavery, and giving up the Rights both of the Church and Crown to procure it.*

I am entirely of St. Hierom's Mind, in the following Words, against *John Bishop of Hierusalem*. — *Propheta, pax, pax, & ubi est pax? Nihil enim grande est pacem voce prætendere, & opere destruere; aliud niti, aliud demonstrare; verbis sonare concordiam, re exigere servitutem. Volumus & nos pacem, & non solum volumus, sed & rogamus; sed pacem Christi, pacem veram, pacem sine inimicitiis, pacem in qua non sit bellum involutum, pacem quæ non ut adversarios subjiciat, sed ut amicos jungat. Quid dominationem pacem vocamus, & non redimimus unicuique rei vocabulum suum?*

With my Prayers for you and your's, and all the faithful Members of your National Church, I am,



Reverend Sir,

Your very affectionate Brother and Servant,

G. SMITH.

ho was
, &c.),
No
en will
rms, it
re they
to the
or my
ne two
, with
there-
hough
old to
being
and a
canda-

eserve
with
y add
ernestly
under
ducing
wn to

ds, a-
ubi est
ruere;
re ser-
rogat-
rem in
ficiat,
n red-

Mem-

TH.